



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2000

No. 108

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m.

Priest Venkatchalapathi Samuldrala, Shiva Hindu Temple, Parma, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

O God, You are Omnipresent, Omnipotent, and Omniscient. You are in everything and nothing is beyond You. You are our Mother and Father and we are all Your children. Whatever You do is for our good. You are the ocean of mercy and You forgive our errors. You are our teacher and You guide us into righteousness.

Today, in this great Hall, are assembled the elected Representatives of the people of this Nation. They are ready to perform their duties. God, please guide them in their thoughts and actions so they can achieve the greatest good for all.

We end this invocation with a prayer from the ancient scriptures of India:

May all be happy
May all be free from disease
May all realize what is good
May none be subject to misery
Peace, peace, peace be unto all.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1729. An act to designate the Federal facility located at 1301 Emmet Street in Charlottesville, Virginia, as the "Pamela B. Gwin Hall".

H.R. 1901. An act to designate the United States border station located in Pharr, Texas, as the "Kika de la Garza United States Border Station".

H.R. 1959. An act to designate the Federal building located at 643 East Durango Boulevard in San Antonio, Texas, as the "Adrian A. Spears Judicial Training Center".

H.R. 4608. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 220 West Depot Street in Greeneville, Tennessee, as the "James H. Quillen United States Courthouse".

H. Con. Res. 394. Concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of the Senate to make technical corrections in the enrollment of S. 1374.

The message also announced that, pursuant to sections 276h-276k of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) as Chair of the Senate Delegation to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Union during the One Hundred Sixth Congress.

WELCOME TO PRIEST VENKATCHALAPATHI SAMULDRALA

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day for Indian-American relations. For the first time, a Hindu priest has given the opening prayer at a session of Congress, and the Prime Minister of India later this morning will address a joint session of Congress.

India and the United States share the bonds of history and culture. Our two great nations share a commitment to both the ideals and the practice of democracy. The close ties between the world's oldest democracy and the world's largest democracy are invaluable to encourage free and fair elections throughout the world.

The United States is also home to an Indian-American community of 1.4 million people. I requested the House Chaplain and Speaker to invite Mr. Samuldrala to give today's prayer as a testimony to the religious diversity that is the hallmark of our great Nation.

I want to thank Mr. Samuldrala for his thoughtful prayer that reminds us that, while we may differ in culture and traditions, we are all alike in the most basic aspiration of peace and righteousness.

I thank the House Chaplain for inviting Mr. Samuldrala and look forward to future efforts to strengthen the bonds between our two great nations.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. After consultation with the majority and minority leaders and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that during the joint meeting to hear an address by His Excellency Atal Bihari Vajpayee, only the doors immediately opposite the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7579

Speaker and those on his right and left will be open. No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

Due to the large attendance which is anticipated, the Chair feels that the rule regarding the privileges of the floor must be strictly adhered to. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is required.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, September 7, 2000, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

During the recess, beginning at about 9:52 a.m., the following proceedings were had:

□ 0945

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE, PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA

The Speaker of the House presided.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Richard Wilson, announced the President pro tempore and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort His Excellency Atal Bihari Vajpayee, the Prime Minister of India, into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY);

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS);

The gentleman from California (Mr. COX);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN);

The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER);

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE);

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD);

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT);

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ);

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON);

The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN);

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE);

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN); and

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The President pro tempore of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as a committee on the part of the Senate to escort His Excellency Atal Bihari Vajpayee, the Prime Minister of India, into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT);

The Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR);

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS);

The Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK);

The Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL);

The Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE);

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN);

The Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN);

The Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID);

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY); and

The Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN).

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, His Excellency Kingsley Layne, Ambassador of St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

□ 1007

At 10 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m., the Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Prime Minister of India, His Excellency Atal Bihari Vajpayee.

The Prime Minister of India, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, it is my great privilege and I deem it a high honor and a personal pleasure to present to you the Prime Minister of India, His Excellency, Atal Bihari Vajpayee.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY, ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE, PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA

Prime Minister VAJPAYEE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President pro tem, honorable Members of the United States Congress, it is with a deep sense of honor that I speak to you today. I would like to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the Members of the Congress, for giving me this opportunity.

In November 1999, a remarkable event took place in the House of Representatives. By a vote 396 to 4, the House adopted a resolution congratulating India and my government on the successful elections completed in October 1999. This display of broad-based bipartisan support for strengthening relations with India is heartening. It is a source of encouragement to both Presi-

dent Clinton and to me, as we work together to infuse a new quality in our ties. I thank you for the near-unique approach that you have adopted towards my country.

Those of you who saw the warm response to President Clinton's speech to our Parliament in March this year will recognize that similar cross-party support exists in India as well for deeper engagement with the United States of America.

I am also deeply touched by the resolution adopted in the House 2 days ago welcoming my visit and the prospect of close Indo-U.S. understanding. I am equally encouraged by the resolution adopted by the Senate yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, American people have shown that democracy and individual liberty provide the conditions in which knowledge progresses, science discovers, innovation occurs, enterprise thrives, and, ultimately, people advance.

To more than a million and a half from my country, America is now home. In turn, their industry, enterprise and skills are contributing to the advancement of American society.

I see in the outstanding success of the Indian community in America a metaphor of the vast potential that exists in Indo-U.S. relations, of what we can achieve together. Just as American experience has been a lesson in what people can achieve in a democratic framework, India has been the laboratory of a democratic process rising to meet the strongest challenges that can be flung at it.

In the half century of our independent existence, we have woven an exquisite tapestry. Out of diversity we have brought unity. The several languages of India speak with one voice under the roof of our Parliament.

In your remarkable experiment as a Nation state, you have proven the same truth. Out of the huddled masses that you welcomed to your shores, you have created a great Nation.

For me, the most gratifying of the many achievements of Indian democracy has been the change it has brought to the lives of the weak and the vulnerable. To give just one figure, in recent years it has enabled more than a million women in small towns and distant villages to enter local elected councils and to decide on issues that touch upon their lives.

□ 1015

Two years ago, while much of Asia was convulsed by economic crises, India held its course. In the last 10 years, we have grown at 6.5 percent per year. That puts India among the 10 fastest growing economies of the world.

Economic activity gets more and more diversified by the year. President Clinton and many among the friends gathered here have had occasion to glimpse our advances in information technology.

We are determined to sustain the momentum of our economy. Our aim is to

double our per capita income in 10 years, and that means we must grow at 9 percent a year.

To achieve this order of growth, we have ushered in comprehensive reforms. We are committed to releasing the creative genius of our people, the entrepreneurial skills of the men and women of the country, of its scientists and craftsmen. At the same time, we in India remain committed to the primacy of the State in fulfilling its social obligations to the deprived, the weak, and the poor.

Important sectors of the country's infrastructure, power, insurance, banking, telecom, are being opened to private initiative, domestic and foreign. Trade barriers are being lowered.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, there are forces outside our country that believe that they can use terror to unravel the territorial integrity of India. They wish to show that a multi-religious society cannot exist. They pursue a task in which they are doomed to fail.

No country has faced as ferocious an attack of terrorist violence as India has over the past 2 decades. Twenty-one thousand were killed by foreign sponsored terrorists in Punjab alone, and 16,000 have been killed in Jammu and Kashmir.

As many of you here in the Congress have in recent hearings recognized a stark fact: no region is a greater source of terrorism than our neighborhood. Indeed, in our neighborhood, in this, the 21st century, religious war has not just been fashioned into, it has been proclaimed to be, an instrument of State policy.

Distance offers no insulation. It should not cause complacency. You know and I know such evil cannot succeed. But even in failing, it could inflict untold suffering. That is why the United States and India have begun to deepen their cooperation for combating terrorism. We must redouble these efforts.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, there was a time when we were on the other side of each other's globes. Today, on every digital map, India and the United States are neighbors and partners.

India and the United States have taken the lead in shaping the information age. Over the last decade, this new technology has sustained American prosperity in a way that has challenged conventional wisdom on economic growth. We are two nations blessed with extraordinary resources and talent. Measured in terms of the industries of tomorrow, we are together defining the partnerships of the future.

But our two countries have the potential to do more to shape the character of the global economy in this century. We should turn the example of our own cooperation into a partnership that uses the possibilities of the new technologies for defining new ways of fighting poverty, illiteracy, hunger, disease, and pollution.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, we believe that India and America can, and should, march hand in hand towards a world in which economic conditions improve for all. A situation that provides comfortable living standards to one-third of the world's population, but condemns the remaining two-thirds to poverty and want is unsustainable.

The foremost responsibility that the 21st century has cast on all of us is to change this unacceptable legacy of the past. It should be our common endeavor to overcome this legacy. I, therefore, propose a comprehensive global dialogue on development. We would be happy to offer New Delhi as the venue for this dialogue.

In this Congress, you have often expressed concern about the future contours of Asia. Will it be an Asia that will be at peace with itself? Or will it be a continent where countries seek to redraw boundaries and settle claims, historical or imaginary, through force?

We seek an Asia where power does not threaten stability and security. We do not want the domination of some to crowd out the space for others. We must create an Asia where cooperative rather than aggressive assertion of national self-interests defines behavior among nations.

If we want an Asia fashioned on such ideals, a democratic, prosperous, tolerant, pluralistic, stable Asia, if we want an Asia where our vital interests are secure, then it is necessary for us to re-examine old assumptions.

It is imperative for India and the United States to work together more closely in pursuit of these goals. In the years ahead, a strong, democratic and economically prosperous India standing at the crossroads of all of the major cultural and economic zones of Asia will be an indispensable factor of stability in the region.

Our cooperation for peace and stability requires us to also define the principles of our own engagement. We must be prepared to accommodate our respective concerns. We must have mutual confidence to acknowledge our respective roles and complementary responsibilities in areas of vital importance to each of us.

Security issues have cast a shadow on our relationship. I believe this is unnecessary. We have much in common and no clash of interests.

We both share a commitment to ultimately eliminating nuclear weapons. We have both declared voluntary moratoriums on testing.

India understands your concerns. We do not wish to unravel your non-proliferation efforts. We wish you to understand our security concerns.

We are at a historic moment in our ties. As we embark on our common endeavor to build a new relationship, we must give practical shape to our shared belief that democracies can be friends, partners, and allies.

In recent years, through all of the good and difficult times, we have spo-

ken to each other more often than we have ever done in the past. I thank President Clinton for his leadership and vision in steering this dialogue. I sincerely thank Members of this Congress for supporting and encouraging this process.

As we talk with candor, we open the doors to new possibilities and new areas of cooperation, in advancing democracy, in combating terrorism, in energy and environment, science and technology, and in international peace-keeping. And we are discovering that our shared values and common interests are leading us to seek a natural partnership of shared endeavors.

India and the United States have taken a decisive step away from the past. The dawn of the new century has marked a new beginning in our relations.

Let us work to fulfill this promise and the hope of today.

Let us remove the shadow of hesitation that lies between us and our joint vision.

Let us use the strength of all that we have in common to build together a future that we wish for ourselves and for the world that we live in.

Thank you.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 10 o'clock and 28 minutes a.m., the Prime Minister of India, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

□ 1030

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 10 o'clock and 30 minutes a.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess until approximately 11 a.m.

□ 1104

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska) at 11 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 one-minute speeches.

CALL TO PAY OFF OUR DEBT

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, a call to action has been given. The Clinton-Gore administration has been called upon to join this Republican Congress in protecting the future of the younger generations of Americans.

The Republican leadership has called upon the President to make a real commitment by joining our effort to use up to 90 percent of the surplus to pay off the national debt.

Yet, what has been the President's response to this call to action? Well, so far it has been ambivalence. He has said, well, that depends on "what the various spending commitments are."

Well, Mr. President, that simply is not good enough. It is time to stop wasteful Washington spending and pay off our national debt.

This fiscally responsible Republican Congress is protecting the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds; and now it is time to pay off the public debt so that our children will not be burdened by it in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the administration to join with us and my colleagues on this fair, middle ground to pay off our national debt and to protect the future of our Nation and of our children.

CHILDHOOD CANCER MONTH

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, September is Childhood Cancer Month.

Unfortunately, today cancer is the number one disease killer of children. This devastation knows no boundaries. It cuts across all social, economic and ethnic groups.

This year alone, an estimated 12,400 children will be diagnosed with cancer and 2,300 will die from the disease.

Despite the advances in early detection and treatment, only two-thirds of children diagnosed with cancer survive. And data shows that the incidence of cancer among children has increased 20 percent over the past 20 years.

So this must stop.

Even though the majority of children's leukemia are now curable, mortality is still substantial among children with solid tumors.

The progress in medical research in childhood cancer should be celebrated, but much more work needs to be done in pediatric cancer research.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, childhood cancer still remains an underrecognized and underserved need.

The time to change is now. Our children are our future.

DISPUTE OVER KASHMIR

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about the refugees and others who suffer as a result of the dispute over Kashmir between India and Pakistan.

We heard earlier in joint session about the suffering on the Indian side. Well, earlier this year I visited a camp on the Pakistani side that was filled with Kashmiris who were wounded or who had relatives who were wounded or dead from fighting. Several had their limbs cut off by their Indian adversaries.

These Kashmiris pleaded with me to urge the U.N. to get involved and somehow bring an end to the bloodshed and suffering of the Kashmiri people and relief to the refugees. They are called displaced persons, not refugees, so they are ineligible for relief.

Some reports suggest that over a million people have become refugees since 1947 as a result of the conflict.

Madam Speaker, I urge Secretary General Kofi Annan to appoint a special envoy to help bring an end to this conflict to get the two sides to the negotiating table. I urge the governments of Pakistan and India to dialogue with each other, find a solution to this long, drawn out conflict.

And why not allow the Kashmiris to hold a referendum for self-determination? India is the world's largest democracy. What is wrong with letting people in Kashmir vote on their future?

In the meantime, forces should pull back from the line of conflict and relief should be provided to the suffering refugees of Kashmir.

"IN GOD IS OUR TRUST"

(Mr. SCHAFFER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHAFFER. Madam Speaker, on this day, 186 years ago in 1814, Francis Scott Key penned the Star-Spangled Banner. Key was both a prominent attorney and a man of strong Christian faith and convictions. In fact, he was one of the early leaders of the American Sunday School movement. And while a U.S. Attorney under President Andrew Jackson, Key carried on significant discourses about faith with leading Members of the United States Congress.

It is no surprise, then, that the fourth version of Key's Star-Spangled

Banner sets forth the religious language of our national motto years before it was officially adopted. Recalling the language of that fourth verse:

"Blest with vict'ry and peace may the Heaven rescued land

"Praise the Power that hath made and preserved us a nation!

"Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just,

"And this be our motto, 'In God is our trust.'

"And the star-spangled banner in triumph shall wave.

"O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

"In God is Our Trust" was penned by Francis Scott Key as our national motto on this day in 1814; and the truth of that motto is as real today as it was 186 years ago.

NFL HOUSTON TEXANS

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, it has been 3 long years and Houston once again has a professional football team, an NFL team. That name last week was decided to be the Houston Texans.

Since 1997, when the Oilers left Houston to go on to Tennessee, football fans have hoped and dreamed for this moment. In Houston it was a long and hard road. Even though it is only 3 years, it seems like many more.

I want to thank the owner who brought the NFL back to Houston, Bob McNair. Without his hard work, dedication and effort, we would not have this possible, but also to the people of Houston and Harris County who voted to build the new stadium right next to the eighth wonder of the world, the Astrodome.

As any Texan can tell us, football is more than just a sport or game, it is a religion in Texas. Texans are crazy about football, and Houstonians are now crazy about the Houston Texans.

Professional football has a long history in my hometown. In the early days of the AFL, the Houston Oilers were a powerhouse, winning the championships in 1961 and 1962; and when they merged the AFL and NFL, Houston was competitive each year.

Such great players as Dan Pastorini, Earl Campbell, and Billy "White Shoes" Johnson led our team to the brink of the Super Bowl.

Houstonians continue to stand by their team in good times and in bad, and now we are ready for the professional Houston Texans.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to the on-field debut of the Houston Texans in 2002. I am eager to resume our annual Governor's Cup with a victory over the Dallas Cowboys.

CHILDHOOD CANCER MONTH

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, when we think of a day in the life of a child, we may immediately think of toys, playgrounds, and laughter. Rarely, if ever, do chemotherapy, hospitalization, and blood transfusions come to mind.

Yet, the harsh reality is that they will become just a routine part of the day for the well over 12,000 children who will become victims of cancer this year.

Cancer is the number one killer of children, and its incidence has been rising every year for the past 20 years.

Alexander Zimmerman, the 4-year-old son of my district director, is currently fighting a rare form of a brain tumor.

And we cannot forget Caroline, the daughter of our colleague the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), who recently passed away from her battle with neuroblastoma.

Pediatric oncology remains underrecognized and underserved, which is why Congress should fund what could be the largest children's oncology facility in the Nation, the University of Miami's Batchelor Children's Center.

We believe that if Congress does its part, things like playgrounds, toys, and laughter will once again become the daily routine.

We should also fund graduate medical education for pediatric hospitals, such as Miami Children's Hospital, which trains our Nation's leading pediatric oncologists.

This September, as we commemorate Childhood Cancer Month, I urge my colleagues to fund efforts toward pediatric cancer research because every child's life is precious.

TRAGIC PASSING OF ENSIGN KRISTOPHER KROHNE

(Mr. BILBRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BILBRAY. Madam Speaker, I come to the well of the House floor to talk about a very sad case, the tragic death of a former intern of mine, Kris Krohne.

Kris was an honorable and ambitious young man who died pursuing his dream of serving this country as a Naval aviator. Last Wednesday, Navy Ensign Kris Krohne was performing his second solo flight at Vance Air Force Base when his plane crashed. Kris was only 24 years old.

As a parent who has lost a son, my heart goes out to his parents, both retired Naval officers, Theodore and Kay, and his brother Karl. I extend my sympathies from those of us in the entire San Diego community to them.

I remember Kris as a bright and personable student who worked hard while interning in my office in D.C. in the spring of 1998. I was saddened to hear of his sudden death.

Kris' spirit will live on in the hearts and minds of everyone he touched. We

will never forget the great contribution he made to our office and what a great and dedicated American he was to want to serve his country.

Our thoughts and our prayers go out to his family, and we will all be praying for them in their time of grief.

□ 1115

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISTOOK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material during further consideration of H.R. 4942.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to House Resolution 563 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4942.

□ 1116

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4942) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 26, 2000, pending was amendment number 23 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) has 9 minutes remaining in debate and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) has 11½ minutes remaining in debate.

The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, Members will recall that the matter involving contraception turned on when a veto would take place. The mayor had promised a veto. He believed that a pocket veto was the appropriate way to proceed because, as this body well knows, if a veto is straight out that is a declaration of war. There may be a compromise thereafter, but it is a little more difficult.

So my amendment addressed the notion that the mayor should be allowed to pocket veto and we should respect his word that a pocket veto would take place. That pocket veto has taken place.

The chairman knows that he had written language that was otherwise acceptable to me. It is perhaps not the exact language I would have written with respect to contraception, but I had discussions with him concerning his language. I understand his concern on his side of the aisle. I have asked my own Members on this side of the aisle to consider that what we are trying to do is to get some kind of understanding that we can all live with to get this bill passed. I am not prepared to ask for anything further now that the bill has been vetoed, except that I would like to ask the chairman if that is satisfactory to him and, if so, if he would accept my amendment.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) correctly states, we were in a situation where her amendment was simply trying to strike language from the bill which would disapprove pending legislation in the District of Columbia. That legislation, since we were here last on this bill, has been pocket vetoed by the mayor of the District of Columbia. Therefore, there is no need to have the language in the bill whereby Congress disapproves that local legislation because, indeed, it has already been disapproved by the action of the mayor. Therefore, there is no need for the language in the bill and certainly I am ready to accept, and I believe our side is ready to accept, the amendment from the gentlewoman.

For clarification, for anyone, lest there be any confusion, the amendment that is under consideration right now offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) simply says that Congress is not taking action to disapprove this legislation by the District. However, there remains intact, it is not affected by the amendment, the congressional instructions to the District that any legislation regarding mandatory coverage of contraceptives and insurance must include a conscience clause. The amendment of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) does not touch that language in the bill. That language remains.

I think that is what she is referring to as far as the good faith concerns of a great many Members. Since the item in the bill is moot, there is no need for the language in subsection (a) and I certainly agree to accept the amendment of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), and if the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is agreeable, I would like to ask that we both yield back the remainder of our time so we may be done with this item.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Norton amendment.

I am appalled that this House is trying to stop the D.C. City Council from implementing a measure they've already approved!

This is a true sign that some of my colleagues want to trample the rights of the city council and people of this district.

I know that the people of our districts wouldn't stand for this!

The language in this bill that prohibits health care coverage for contraceptives discriminates against the women of D.C.—just because they live here.

We must stand up for the rights of all women to have access to contraceptive coverage, by voting to allow access to contraceptives here in the District of Columbia.

Contraceptive care gives our mothers and families the ability to make important choices that affect their lives. And, we know that unwanted pregnancy and abortion rates drop when women have access to preventive reproductive health care.

Let's let women make decisions about their reproductive health with their doctors.

I urge my colleagues to support the Norton amendment to make contraceptive coverage accessible to the women of D.C.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be accepted, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the remainder of the bill is considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 169. (a) Chapter 23 of title 11, District of Columbia, is hereby repealed.

(b) The table of chapters for title 11, District of Columbia, is amended by striking the item relating to chapter 23.

(c) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date on which legislation enacted by the Council of the District of Columbia to establish the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner in the executive branch of the government of the District of Columbia takes effect.

PROMPT PAYMENT OF APPOINTED COUNSEL

SEC. 170. (a) ASSESSMENT OF INTEREST FOR DELAYED PAYMENTS.—If the Superior Court of the District of Columbia or the District of Columbia Court of Appeals does not make a payment described in subsection (b) prior to the expiration of the 45-day period which begins on the date the Court receives a completed voucher for a claim for the payment, interest shall be assessed against the amount of the payment which would otherwise be made to take into account the period which begins on the day after the expiration of such 45-day period and which ends on the day the Court makes the payment.

(b) PAYMENTS DESCRIBED.—A payment described in this subsection is—

(1) a payment authorized under section 11-2604 and section 11-2605, DC Code (relating to representation provided under the District of Columbia Criminal Justice Act);

(2) a payment for counsel appointed in proceedings in the Family Division of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia under chapter 23 of title 16, DC Code; or

(3) a payment for counsel authorized under section 21-2060, DC Code (relating to representation provided under the District of Columbia Guardianship, Protective Proceedings, and Durable Power of Attorney Act of 1986).

(c) STANDARDS FOR SUBMISSION OF COMPLETED VOUCHERS.—The chief judges of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Court of Appeals shall establish standards and criteria for determining whether vouchers submitted for claims for payments described in subsection (b) are complete, and shall publish and make such standards and criteria available to attorneys who practice before such Courts.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the assessment of interest against any claim (or portion of any claim) which is denied by the Court involved.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to claims received by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia or the District of Columbia Court of Appeals after the expiration of the 90-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2001."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BILBRAY

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. BILBRAY:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

BANNING POSSESSION OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS BY MINORS

SEC. ____ (a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any individual under 18 years of age to possess any cigarette or other tobacco product in the District of Columbia.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) POSSESSION IN COURSE OF EMPLOYMENT.—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to an individual making a delivery of cigarettes or tobacco products in pursuance of employment.

(2) PARTICIPATION IN LAW ENFORCEMENT OPERATION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to an individual possessing products in the course of a valid, supervised law enforcement operation.

(c) PENALTIES.—Any individual who violates subsection (a) shall be subject to the following penalties:

(1) For any violation, the individual may be required to perform community service or attend a tobacco cessation program.

(2) Upon the first violation, the individual shall be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed \$50.

(3) Upon the second and each subsequent violation, the individual shall be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed \$100.

(4) Upon the third and each subsequent violation, the individual may have his or her driving privileges in the District of Columbia suspended for a period of 90 consecutive days.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply during fiscal year 2001 and each succeeding fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 563, the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BILBRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that we have to be discussing this item again this year. It is an item that I had brought before this body two previous years. Last year, I agreed, after a request by the legislative body of the City of Washington, D.C., and the mayor, that they be allowed to address this issue. I withdrew it last year, as a courtesy to the local city council and the mayor, on the possibility that they could address a gap in the law that governs our Federal District.

Sadly to say, Mr. Chairman, the action after 12 months has not been forthcoming as indicated at that time. All my bill does, Mr. Chairman, is point out the fact that when we talk about tobacco possession use and abuse by minors, we need to do everything that we can to avoid the problem before it starts.

Now I think that we all agree that the most critical thing we can do in the United States to avoid the hideous deaths related to tobacco consumption is to keep our young people from getting involved at an early age. The strategies in many States across the country, including my own State of California, has been to address the purchase and use issue, among minors and adults. The use in public is very strongly restricted in California, but then California and many States have realized that there was a gaping hole in the tobacco approach. The anti-tobacco approach had a gaping hole that sent the wrong message to our young people, and that wrong message was, well, one cannot legally buy it but once they have possession they can smoke it all they want; they can possess it all they want.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out how inconsistent that message is to our young people. I am a parent of five children. My children have spent a lot of time here in the Federal District and, frankly, I think all of us should be concerned about the message that we send to young people about the possession and use of tobacco.

I do not think any reasonable parent would want the United States Government to send a message that underage use and possession of tobacco is okay, but we also would not want to send the same message about alcohol consumption.

Now, I cannot fathom how we have overlooked this issue for so long. We would not do it with alcohol. If young people were walking down the street with a six pack of beer, we would expect the law to address the item. Sadly, here in Washington, D.C., the law does not address children walking down the street with a pack of cigarettes.

This mixed message needs to be corrected, and I know there are those that like us, as the Congress, to look the

other way, not get involved with this issue, but I think for all of us, especially somebody like myself who not only have children but serve on the Subcommittee on Health and Environment, to say that Washington will set the example that underage purchase, possession, and use of tobacco is not acceptable and it is not something we will stand by and ignore for any longer.

Mr. Chairman, all my bill proposes to do is to apply the same regulation technique here in Washington, D.C., as is applied in Virginia and in Maryland. We have both States surrounding this Federal District that have said that minors' possession and use of tobacco is not acceptable and should be outlawed. All I am asking is, as Congress, under our responsibility under the Constitution, as the legislative body that would serve very parallel to what the State legislature in Maryland and Virginia have done and that is to say that minor possession is no longer acceptable within our jurisdiction.

All we are saying is that we will no longer stand by while Washington, D.C., remains an oasis, a sanctuary, for underage consumption of tobacco and that we will support the surrounding communities in this strategy of eradicating as much of minor consumption as possible, starting by setting the example that possession and use of tobacco by minors is not only inappropriate it is wrong and it should be illegal.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

§§ 25-130. Purchase, possession or consumption by persons under 21; misrepresentation of age; penalties.

(a) No person who is under 21 years of age shall purchase, attempt to purchase, possess, or drink any alcoholic beverage in the District, except that a person who is under 21 years of age may temporarily possess an alcoholic beverage if the temporary possession is necessary to perform lawful employment responsibilities.

(b) No person shall falsely represent his or her age, or possess or present as proof of age an identification document which is in any way fraudulent, for the purpose of procuring an alcoholic beverage in the District.

(b-1) Any person under 21 years of age who falsely represents his or her age for the purpose of procuring alcoholic any beverage shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be fined for each offense not more than \$300, and in default in the payment of the fine shall be imprisoned not exceeding 30 days.

(b-2) A civil fine may be imposed as an alternative sanction for any infraction of this section, or any rules or regulations issued under the authority of this chapter, pursuant to §§ 6-2701 to 6-2723 ("Civil Infractions Act"). Adjudication of any infraction of this section shall be pursuant to § 6-2723.

(c) In addition to the penalties provided in subsections (b-1) and (b-2) of this section, any person who violates any provision of this section shall be subject to the following additional penalties:

(1) Upon the first violation, shall have his or her driving privileges in the District suspended for a period of 90 consecutive days;

(2) Upon the second violation, shall have his or her driving privileges in the District suspended for a period of 180 days; and

(3) Upon the third violation and each subsequent violation, shall have his or her driv-

ing privileges in the District suspended for a period of 1 year.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 23, 2000.

Hon. ANTHONY WILLIAMS,
Mayor, District of Columbia
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAYOR WILLIAMS: Thank you for your correspondence regarding the recent hearing by the City Council of the District of Columbia on legislation related to the prohibition of tobacco product sales to minors.

I appreciate your response to my letter dated April 10, 2000 and I am encouraged that the City Council is addressing the issue of tobacco use by minors. As mentioned in my previous letter, the amendment that I have introduced each of the last two years, and which we personally discussed last year, focuses on minor possession and use of tobacco.

Virginia, Maryland, and over twenty other states have enacted youth possession and consumption laws. It is my belief that we can crack down on the possession of youth tobacco by passing a common sense law similar to what I have introduced in the past and at the same time continue to increase efforts at the point of sales to hold negligent merchants accountable for their illegal actions when they sell tobacco products illegally to minors.

I would like to see parity between youth possession of tobacco and youth possession of alcohol. In all cities across the country, alcohol consumption and possession by minors is prohibited. This is because alcohol is an adult product, tobacco needs to receive the same type of recognition and enforcement.

If we want to be serious about combating the use of tobacco by minors we need to approach this issue on several fronts. As a former mayor myself, I appreciate your hard work on this issue, the progress being made and the inherent challenges of leadership on such issues of controversy. However, as we get deeper into the appropriations process in this second session of the 106th Congress, I want to inform you of my intention to reintroduce my amendment.

As mentioned previously, my amendment is very straightforward. It contains a penalty section, which was modeled after the state of Virginia's penalty section for minors found in violation of tobacco possession. For the first violation, the minor would, at the discretion of the judge, be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed \$50. For the second violation, the minor would be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed \$100. For a third or subsequent violation, the minor would have his or her driver's license suspended for a period of 90 consecutive days. The 90 day suspension is consistent with penalties for minor possession of alcohol in the District of Columbia. Any minor found to be in possession of tobacco may also be required to perform community service or attend a tobacco cessation program. Each of these penalties are at the judge's discretion. It contains a provision to exempt from this prohibition a minor individual "making a delivery of cigarettes or tobacco products in his or her employment" while on the job.

As an original cosponsor of the strongest anti-tobacco bill in the 105th Congress, the Bipartisan NO Tobacco for Kids Act (H.R. 3868), the intentions of my amendment is to encourage youth to take responsibility for their actions. Mayor Williams, I look forward to working with you on this issue and on legislation that will deter youth in the

District of Columbia from ever starting the deadly habit of smoking in the first place.

Sincerely,

BRIAN P. BILBRAY,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 10, 2000.

Hon. ANTHONY WILLIAMS,
Mayor, District of Columbia
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAYOR WILLIAMS: I am writing to make you aware of my intentions to introduce an amendment to the Fiscal Year 2001 D.C. Appropriations Act that will prohibit individuals under the age of 18 years old from possessing and consuming tobacco products in the District of Columbia.

As you remember, we discussed this issue last year during the debate on the FY 2000 D.C. Appropriation Act (H.R. 2587). At that time I had introduced the same amendment, but withdrew it after receiving direct confirmation from you that this issue would be addressed on the local level. However, I have been informed that local action on this initiative has not, to date. I understand that legislation was sent to the Judiciary Committee of the D.C. Council, but was recently withdrawn. As a former mayor myself, I appreciate your hard work on this issue and the inherent challenges of leadership on such issues of controversy. However, as we get deeper into the appropriations process in the second session of the 106th Congress, I believe the time has come to act.

I think it is important that all levels of government work together to help stop children from smoking. I also believe we should send the right message to our children, and the first step in this process would be for the District of Columbia to join Virginia, Maryland, and the twenty other states who have passed youth possession and consumption laws. I would appreciate knowing of your intentions, and to work with you and Members on both sides of the aisle in 2000 to make sure this important piece of legislation becomes law.

To give you some background on this issue, I first introduced this amendment during the 105th Congress, where it received strong bipartisan support and passed through the House by a 238-138 vote on August 6, 1998; however it was not included in the final conference report. At the time I initially introduced this amendment only 21 states in the nation had minor possession laws outlawing tobacco, and my amendment would have added the District of Columbia to this growing list of states.

My amendment is very straight forward and easy to understand. It contains a provision to exempt from this prohibition a minor individual "making a delivery of cigarettes or tobacco products in his or her employment" while on the job. My amendment also contains a penalty section, which was modified after the state of Virginia's penalty section for minors found in violation of tobacco possession. For the first violation, the minor would, at the discretion of the judge, be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed \$50. For the second violation, the minor would be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed \$100. For a third or subsequent violation, the minor would have his or her driver's license suspended for a period of 90 consecutive days. The 90 day suspension is consistent with penalties for minor possession of alcohol in the District of Columbia. Any minor found to be in possession of tobacco may also be required to perform community service or attend a tobacco cessation program. Each of these penalties are at the judge's discretion.

I understand that the District of Columbia already has tough laws on the books to address the issue of sales of tobacco to minors.

My amendment focuses specifically on the possession of tobacco products by minors in order to put minor possession of tobacco with minor possession of alcohol. All three cities in my district have passed anti-possession laws, so I am not asking the District to do anything my own communities have not already done.

As an original cosponsor of the strongest anti-tobacco bill in the 105th Congress, the Bipartisan NO Tobacco for Kids Act (H.R. 3638), the intentions of my amendment is to encourage youth to take responsibility for their actions. Mayor Williams, I look forward to your response on this issue and to working together on legislation that will deter youth in the District of Columbia from ever starting the deadly habit of smoking in the first place.

Sincerely,

BRIAN P. BILBRAY,
Member of Congress.

AMERICAN LUNG ASSOCIATION,

New York, NY, July 26, 2000.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The American Lung Association opposes the Bilbray amendment to the District of Columbia Appropriations bill that penalizes kids for the possession of tobacco products.

Penalizing children has not been proven to be an effective technique to reduce underage tobacco usage. In fact, penalties may adversely affect existing programs that are proven to work and are required, such as compliance checks utilizing young people. The Bilbray amendment would make these checks illegal. The Synar Amendment on marketing tobacco to children could not be enforced because it would be illegal for supervised teens to attempt to purchase tobacco.

Attempts to put the blame on our children, the pawns of decades of sophisticated marketing by the tobacco industry, instead of the manufacturers and retailers, is just another smokescreen by big tobacco. The tobacco industry favors shifting both the blame and the attention away from their marketing efforts onto the shoulders of young persons.

For example, a 1995 study by the Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene discovered that 480 minors were penalized for possessing tobacco but no merchants were fined for selling tobacco to minors. On July 16 and 21, 1998, the American Lung Association conducted an undercover "sting" operation to determine whether teens could purchase tobacco in the U.S. Capitol complex. Five out of nine attempts were successful, and in the House office buildings, all attempts were successful. Here is clear proof that existing laws regarding selling to teens are not being enforced. Existing laws and regulations need to be enforced.

The tobacco industry favors criminalizing our kids. This alone should be adequate reason to reject the Bilbray amendment to the D.C. appropriations bill.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. GARRISON,
Chief Executive Officer.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, May 21, 1999.

Hon. BRIAN P. BILBRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BILBRAY: Thank you for your letter sharing your concern about teenage smoking in the District and your congratulations on my November election to the Office of Mayor.

In response to your inquiry, the District of Columbia is addressing the issue of teen smoking through a variety of methods. DC Public Schools has two programs—The Great American Smoke-out and "2 Smart 2 Smoke"—to raise children's awareness of the dangers of smoking. Additionally, the De-

partment of Health supports the efforts of local and community-based initiatives like "Ad-Up, Word-Up and Speak-Out," which encourages school age children to perform their own research on the effects of advertising directed at children.

Finally, the school system recently elevated possession of tobacco to a "level one" infraction—which means violators could incur the most severe disciplinary measures, including possible suspension. To assess our progress, the District is tracking youth smoking related data through grants provided by the Center for Disease Control.

I want to assure you that I share your concerns about teenage smokers. Sandra Allen, Chairperson of the City Council's Committee on Human Services, and I are working diligently to strengthen enforcement which should, in combination with the other initiatives, result in a real reduction in teenage smoking. We believe that the cumulative effect of these initiatives will have marked improvement on the incidence of teen smoking.

Again thank you for bringing this issue to the forefront of my attention. I agree that discouraging our youth from engaging in this terrible habit of smoking is very important in the fight to curtail tobacco's tragic and inevitable long-term effects.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY A. WILLIAMS,
Mayor.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, May 16, 2000.

Hon. BRIAN P. BILBRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BILBRAY: Thank you for contacting me regarding legislation to prohibit minors from the possession and consumption of tobacco products.

I am committed to working with the City Council of the District of Columbia to protect our children from harmful tobacco products. As part of my commitment to limiting tobacco use, my Fiscal Year 2001 Budget directs the use of Tobacco Settlement Fund dollars for tobacco control, prevention efforts, health promotion and education.

The Council's Committee on Consumer and Regulatory Affairs will consider legislation to prohibit youth consumption of tobacco products, Bill 13-60, the "Enforcement of the Prohibition of Tobacco Product Sales to Minors Act." The bill prohibits the sale of tobacco to minors, increases fines for the sale of tobacco to minors, and prohibits self-service displays, certain advertisements and vending machine sales of tobacco products. Under the legislation, the Department of Health would also be authorized to conduct random inspections of retail establishments that sell tobacco products. On Wednesday, May 10, 2000, the Committee on Consumer and Regulatory Affairs held a public hearing on this bill. Given your concern on this issue, I have asked the Chair, Councilwoman Sharon Ambrose to allow your amendment to be debated during the hearing.

Clearly, restricting access of tobacco sales and penalizing any business that targets or sells to youth is a priority of our local leaders. Therefore, I respectfully request that you withhold introducing your proposed legislation so that we can move forward our local proposal. As a former City Mayor, I am certain that you understand the importance of local government in these public policy issues.

Thank you for your concern for the health and safety of children in the District of Columbia.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY A. WILLIAMS,
Mayor.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN)

is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to respond on this amendment. Mr. Chairman, I want to put into the RECORD the fact that the American Lung Association opposes the Bilbray amendment because it penalizes kids for the possession of tobacco products.

Mr. Chairman, the American Lung Association opposes this because it is not an effective technique to reduce underage tobacco usage. The reality is that the compliance checks that are currently going on would be made illegal by this amendment.

The Synar amendment on marketing tobacco to children could not be enforced because it would be illegal for supervised teens to attempt to purchase tobacco. This an attempt to put the blame on our children, the pawns of decades of sophisticated marketing by the tobacco industry, instead of manufacturers and retailers. It shifts the blame inappropriately.

A study by the Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene discovered that 480 minors were penalized for possessing tobacco and no merchants were penalized.

On July 16 and 21 of 1998, the American Lung Association conducted an undercover sting operation to determine whether teens could purchase tobacco in the U.S. Capitol complex. Five out of nine attempts were successful, and in the House office buildings all attempts were successful in the House office buildings. This is clear proof that existing laws regarding selling to teens are not being enforced. They need to be enforced first. Let us not criminalize our kids.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to put the American Lung Association letter in the RECORD and the Tobacco Free Kids letter in the RECORD opposing the Bilbray amendment.

I am outraged at the amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY). He brings forward this amendment when the city council is in the midst of considering the Bilbray amendment. This amendment went through the House in 1999, the first year of Mayor Williams' term, despite a personal plea from Mayor Williams that he would like to try another approach in the District.

That provision, the Bilbray provision, was one reason why the bill was vetoed in 1999. The provision was removed and sent back here and here comes the Bilbray amendment again.

Mayor Williams knows his city. The gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) does not know Mayor Williams' city.

The mayor again wrote the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) in May, after another threat by the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) to intrude in local affairs was received. Mayor Williams had already partially responded to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY). His budget that we are considering now funds a smoking prevention program for minors.

□ 1130

This in addition to the bill that is in the council, the mayor wrote to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY). And I am quoting, "I respectfully request that you withhold introducing your proposed legislation." I thank the gentleman for his respect of our mayor.

He continued, "so that we can move forward to consider your proposal along with our own local proposal." And he said, "as a former city mayor, I am certain that you understand the importance of local government in these public policy issues."

The gentleman apparently understands how important local knowledge and local prerogatives are as applied to his city of Imperial Beach, California, and he understands it in all the gentleman speeches about devolution, but like an authoritarian rule, the gentleman is trying to impose legislation on a city that is already going strong on a tough issue and in the midst of considering the gentleman's approach among others.

In the District, elevation of possession of tobacco to a level 1 infraction in the D.C. public schools has to be very carefully considered. Shall we do that or not when the measure imposes suspension on a city with one of the highest dropout rates in the country, is that the best thing for my city? I do not think so.

I do not even think I know, but I do think that the mayor of this city knows. He asked the gentleman not to introduce it, and I am asking this Congress not to move forward with it. The mayor and the council have done the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) a courtesy.

The gentleman has refused to do them that today. They are considering the gentleman's approach. Hearings have been held. I am sorry we do not move at the pace the gentleman would like. There are other matters that have to be considered, like our own appropriations that are here, like the fact that our city is just out of insolvency.

But we have said that we will consider the gentleman's approach. We are considering the gentleman's approach. This debate is not about inaction. Our city has moved to put before the entire city council Mr. BILBRAY's approach. He wants his action. This is a free country I say to the gentleman.

We do not impose smoking codes on cities. We allow cities to decide what is best for themselves.

AMERICAN LUNG ASSOCIATION,

Washington, DC, July 25, 2000.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The American Lung Association opposes the Bilbray amendment to the District of Columbia Appropriations bill that penalizes kids for the possession of tobacco products.

Penalizing children has not been proven to be an effective technique to reduce underage tobacco usage. In fact, penalties may adversely effect existing programs that are proven to work and are required, such as compliance checks utilizing young people. The Bilbray amendment would make these checks illegal. The Synar Amendment on marketing tobacco to children could not be enforced because it would be illegal for supervised teens to attempt to purchase tobacco.

Attempts to put the blame on our children, the pawns of decades of sophisticated marketing by the tobacco industry, instead of the manufactures and retailers, is just another smokescreen by big tobacco. The tobacco industry favors shifting both the blame and the attention away from their marketing efforts onto the shoulders of young persons.

For example, a 1995 study by the Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene discovered that 480 minors were penalized for possessing tobacco but no merchants were fined for selling tobacco to minors. On July 16 and 21, 1998, the American Lung Association conducted an undercover "sting" operation to determine whether teens could purchase tobacco in the U.S. Capitol complex. Five out of nine attempts were successful, and in the House office buildings, all attempts were successful. Here is clear proof that existing laws regarding selling to teens are not being enforced. Existing laws and regulations need to be enforced.

The tobacco industry favors criminalizing our kids. This alone should be adequate reason to reject the Bilbray amendment to the D.C. appropriations bill.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. GARRISON,
Chief Executive Officer.

JULY 25, 2000.

Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WAXMAN: The Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids opposes the amendment that may be offered tomorrow by Representative Bilbray to the District of Columbia appropriations bill. This amendment would penalize youth for possession of tobacco products without creating a thoughtful, comprehensive plan to reduce tobacco use among children and without first ensuring that adults who illegally sell tobacco to kids are held responsible.

There is no silver bullet to reducing tobacco use among kids, but this amendment, in the absence of other effective policies, will do little to end tobacco's grip on the children of D.C. There is little evidence to indicate that in the absence of a concerted, comprehensive program, penalizing kids will work to reduce tobacco use rates. A comprehensive, effective program should include not only vigorous enforcement of laws against selling tobacco to kids, but also public education efforts, community and school-based programs, and help for smokers who want to quit.

The narrow focus of this amendment will further divert resources away from effective enforcement of the current laws that prohibit retailers from selling to kids. Although

the District of Columbia penalizes retailers for selling to kids, this law is not being enforced adequately. According to Department of Health and Human Services, compliance checks showed that 46.8 percent of retailers in D.C. sell tobacco products to minors.

Additionally, this amendment does not address the fact that the tobacco industry spends more than \$6.8 billion a year marketing its products. Kids in D.C. continually see tobacco ads on storefronts and in magazines. The tobacco industry's marketing tactics work: 85 percent of kids who smoke use the three most heavily advertised brands (Marlboro, Camel and Newport). In addition, the success of the tobacco industry targeted marketing efforts is evidenced by the fact that 75 percent of young African Americans smoke Newport, a brand heavily marketed to this group.

Any discussion of holding children responsible for their addiction to tobacco should only come after or as part of a comprehensive approach, which insures that adults are being held responsible for marketing and selling to children. Therefore, we ask that you oppose this amendment. Thank you.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW L. MYERS,
President.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Lung Association's concern about the sting operations, have been clarified by the legislative council. My bill does not obstruct sting operations or conflict with provisions in the Synar amendment. These objections are misplaced. All I have to say to the gentlewoman from Washington, D.C. (Ms. NORTON), the City of Alexandria, the City of Baltimore had their legislature require them to treat tobacco possession and use by minors as a law. They were not violated by that.

Cities have certain responsibilities, as a mayor I know that, but so do legislatures. We serve as that legislature, like it or not. It is a constitutional obligation and for those of us who have spent a lot of time fighting the tobacco industry and fighting consumption for tobacco, for us to walk away from this opportunity for another year, it shows the hypocrisy of an institution that cannot do its fair share of fighting underage consumption.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Bilbray amendment.

For decades the tobacco companies have acted more recklessly and caused more harm than any other industry in America. They lied to the American public. They manipulated nicotine in order to addict. And they deliberately targeted our children.

Yet this Congress has failed to act.

Earlier this year, when the Supreme Court ruled that the Congress has not given the Food and Drug Administration explicit authority to regulate tobacco, the Court recognized that tobacco use "poses perhaps the single most significant threat to public health in the United States." The Court decision placed responsibility to deal with this crisis squarely in Congress' lap.

But since that decision in March, this Congress has done nothing. The Republican leadership has not held a single hearing on the problem nor brought any tobacco reform legislation to the floor.

In fact, the only tobacco legislation we considered was a rider to block the tobacco lawsuit and deny veterans their day in court.

This Congress should pass meaningful tobacco legislation. We should grant the FDA explicit authority to regulate tobacco. We should pass performance standards to give the industry meaningful economic incentives to reduce the number of children that smoke. We should pass a national policy on environmental tobacco smoke and put in place a nationwide public education campaign. Together these measures will succeed in reducing the number of children who smoke and will save millions of lives for generations to come.

The amendment before us today may not do any harm—but there is little evidence it will do any significant good. Public health organizations oppose it. The Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids says that this amendment will “do little to end tobacco’s grip on the children of D.C.” The American Lung Association states that penalizing children “may adversely affect existing programs that are proven to work.”

This Congress has abandoned any meaningful national effort to regulate tobacco and to reduce tobacco use among our children. Instead, it is now proposing to legislate questionable policy for just one city.

The Mayor and the City Council of D.C. should be given the opportunity to decide what comprehensive tobacco control policies work best for the children of this city. Just this past May, the City Council held a public hearing on the Bilbray amendment and other measures to prohibit youth consumption of tobacco products. They expect to take up the issue when they meet again this fall. We should allow D.C. to continue with its process and decide what tobacco control policies work best for the city—just like thousands of other city councils in the rest of the country.

In considering this amendment, don’t delude yourself and believe that this approach will reduce tobacco use among our children. The reality is that we need to pass comprehensive tobacco control legislation. We bear the responsibility to protect our children and to hold the tobacco companies accountable for their actions.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. TIAHRT

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. TIAHRT:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. ____ (a) No person may distribute any needle or syringe for the hypodermic injection

of any illegal drug in any area of the District of Columbia which is within 1000 feet of a public or private day care center, elementary school, vocational school, secondary school, college, junior college, or university, or any public housing project, public swimming pool, park, playground, video arcade, or youth center, or an event sponsored by any such entity.

(b) Whoever violates subsection (a) shall be fined not more than \$500 for each needle or syringe distributed in violation of such subsection.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any amount collected by the District of Columbia pursuant to subsection (b) shall be deposited in a separate account of the General Fund of the District of Columbia and used exclusively to carry out (either directly or by contract) drug prevention or treatment programs. For purposes of this subsection, no program of distributing sterile needles or syringes for the hypodermic injection of any illegal drug may be considered a drug prevention or treatment program.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 563, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The amendment that I am offering gives us a clear choice between protecting the children of the District of Columbia or protecting the drug addicts. The District of Columbia City Council has designated drug free school zones in hopes of protecting the children from drug pushers. Hopefully, it will keep kids from being pressured to take illegal drugs that would cheat them from a bright future.

What this amendment does is take the very same language the District of Columbia City Council has used to protect the children and to extend it to the needle exchange program. We would then have needle-free school zones around the areas where children attend school and play.

Mr. Chairman, now, this is not new language or a new concept. It simply clarifies that the exchange of needles to drug addicts should be kept out of the reach of our children, the same as we have tried to keep drugs out of their reach.

Currently, Prevention Works, a drug needle exchange program here in Washington runs 10 needle exchange sites. Of those sites, six needle exchange sites are located within 1,000 feet of at least one public school. These sites pose a very real threat to our children.

I have a map, Mr. Chairman, that was given to me by the police department here in the District of Columbia, showing the locations of where the drug free school zone applies. Those areas are designated in gray, green and pink. The pins that are pointed out here show the 10 needle exchange sites with the four that would currently not be affected by this amendment, and the six that would be affected by this amendment.

At the corner of 15th and A Street, Northeast location, a member of my

staff found a piece of a needle, across the street from Eastern Senior High School, just a few feet away from where three little girls were jumping rope. I worry that contaminated needles, discarded needles from the needle exchange site may infect children just like these three girls. It is an unnecessary risk for children.

This amendment is designed to protect these girls and all children in the District of Columbia. This is a clear choice, Mr. Chairman. My colleagues can either choose to protect the children or protect the drug addicts. I hope the House will choose to protect the children.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we are adamantly opposed to this. On the face of it, it looks like it might be reasonable, but it is a thousand feet away from every place, every activity where children may be involved, parks, recreation, schools, video arcades. This is a small city. If we take a 1,000 feet around the perimeter of all of these activities, the only place left to conduct this program that has been so effective, has been the most effective way of combatting a scourge that is worse than in any other city in the country, particularly affecting women and children, and that is HIV infection. This is the program that works, but we cannot conduct this program under the Tiahrt amendment, except in the Potomac River, on the White House lawn, at Bolling Air Force Base or at the Old Soldier’s Home, there may be a couple other places, but there are very few, probably the Washington Mall, but there are very, very few places under this amendment that could ever conduct a program.

Effectively what it does is to say, you cannot conduct this program. It is an allegedly clever way to kill a program that works. We are adamantly opposed to it. If this stays in, I will tell my colleagues this bill will be vetoed, because we have a program that works for people who desperately need it to work.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, here is more veto bait. This is an attempt by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) to do what he could not do last year and to do what he was not even able to do in the Committee on Appropriations, and that is to kill the program. It is a poison bill. It is designed to kill a program that is saving the lives of children, innocent children in the District of Columbia.

Children do find needles, but the gentleman has no evidence that those needles come from the needle exchange program. They come from addicts where there are not, in fact, programs. The gentleman is not expert on how needles infect school children in the District, but the D.C. Police Chief Charles Ramsey does, and I am now quoting him from a letter he wrote the House, "the current needle exchange program is well managed and has an exemplary return rate. I have no reports that indicate that the program has been abused in any way or created serious public policy problems in the District."

I ask Members to listen to our police chief and not the gentleman from Kansas about what should happen in this city. This is a disease that has become a black and brown disease. It is killing African Americans. It is killing minorities. It has moved from gays to people of color.

People of color see this directed against them. They know what saves lives, and those who vote for this amendment are voting to kill men, women, and children in my district. I am asking Members to oppose this amendment and go back to what we have reluctantly accepted, and that is an amendment that is before this House that would leave us with no local funds, no Federal funds, and only a very modest and hardly standing private program that must fish for money wherever it can.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that both sides be granted an additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, there are plenty of needles within 1000 feet of schools, housing projects and playgrounds. Unfortunately, they are dirty needles and their use is spreading AIDS and promoting drug abuse, but this amendment will do nothing, nothing to change that tragic reality. We are really kidding ourselves if we believe we can stop drug abuse by banning one of the few public health measures that actually makes a difference in the real world.

When I was prosecuting and putting people in jail for drug use, for drug trafficking, I supported local needle exchange efforts because they work. They do not encourage drug abuse, and they do save lives by halting AIDS and other serious diseases transmitted by dirty needles. Serious problems demand serious solutions. Reject this amendment.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Tiahrt amendment,

because it would interfere with the District's ability to save lives, put very simply, by operating needle exchange programs which have been proven to reduce new HIV infections in this country, especially among children.

Three quarters of new HIV infection in children are a result of injection drug use by a parent. Why would we pass up an opportunity to save a child's life by shutting down programs that work? HIV/AIDS remains the leading cause of death among African Americans ages 25 to 44 in the District.

In spite of these statistics, this amendment attempts to shut down the very program that the local community has established to reduce new HIV infections. This Congress should be supporting decisions that local communities make about their healthcare, not limiting their control.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to mention a number of organizations, the American Medical Association, the American Public Health Association have concluded that needle exchange programs are effective.

The Surgeon General's Report has said that it found conclusively that needle exchange programs reduce HIV transmission and do not increase drug use. Support local control and oppose the Tiahrt amendment.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, this is a clear choice. This is not about the needle exchange program. This is about protecting children. One of the comments that was made by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) was that this will keep the needle exchange program 1,000 feet away from the children from where they are playing; that is exactly the point. We want to protect the children.

The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) said there is no evidence that these needles come from the needle exchange program. Yet Calvin Fay, the director of the International Scientific and Medical Forum on Drug Abuse says, and I quote, "first, most needle exchange programs are not exchanges at all, but are needle giveaways, since participants rarely exchange a dirty needle for a clean one, which means that the dirty needles remain on the streets."

□ 1145

The only way we can protect the children is to keep these needle exchange programs away from the kids.

Mr. Chairman, my concern is that if this is not passed, and since there is no accounting for needles that are passed out to drug addicts, that they will be available for children to become infected by. While members may disagree on the effectiveness of the needle exchange program, I think we can all agree we do not want these infected needles in our children's midst, near public playgrounds or public pools.

Besides the immediate danger of needles themselves, I worry about the threat to children's safety that needle

exchange programs do when they invite drug pushers and addicts into places where children should be safe.

I also worry the needle exchange program will send the wrong message about drug use to our children. We try to send children an unequivocal message that drugs are wrong and that they can kill you. I worry that if these drug addicts receive needles, rather than condemnation, they will not understand that drugs are wrong.

As our drug czar, Barry McCaffrey, stated: "Above all, we have a responsibility to protect our children from ever falling victim to the false allure of drugs. We do this, first and foremost, by making sure that we send one clear, straightforward message about drugs: they are wrong, and they can kill you."

This amendment is about the safety of our children. It is not about the effectiveness of a needle exchange program. It is a very simple choice. Those who oppose my amendment will argue that the Tiahrt amendment, if adopted, would shut down a needle exchange program in the District of Columbia. This is not true. There still are plenty of sites in the District of Columbia to conduct a needle exchange program.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the House to pass this amendment and protect the children of the District of Columbia, and I hope we will give them a higher priority than we do those who inject illegal drugs into their veins. It is a very simple choice. It is not about the needle exchange program; it is about children. You can choose between protecting the children, or protecting the drug addicts.

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against the Tiahrt amendment because I think it is not sound public health policy.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Tiahrt amendment which would prevent the exchange of needles within 1000 feet of schools, day care centers, playgrounds, public housing and other areas which are gathering places for children. This amendment, is nothing more than a backdoor approach to prohibit the District of Columbia from using even its own funds for needle exchange programs. The Tiahrt amendment severely limits the physical space in which a needle exchange could operate and is written so broadly that virtually no area in the District of Columbia would be eligible to have a needle exchange program.

Mr. Chairman, a July report found that one in twenty adults in the District of Columbia is currently living with HIV or AIDS. The District of Columbia has the highest rate of new HIV infections of any jurisdiction in the country. From July 1998 to June of 1999, the rate of AIDS cases reported in women was more than nine times the national rate. HIV transmission in the District via intravenous drug use disproportionately affects women and African-Americans. For women, IV drug use is the most prevalent mode of transmission. Ninety-six percent of those infected in D.C., due to IV drug use, are African-Americans.

There are currently more than 113 needle exchange programs operating in 30 states, including my State of Maryland. In 1994, the Baltimore City Health Department established a needle exchange program. The program exchanges sterile for contaminated syringes, as well as provides public health services including referrals to drug abuse treatment, HIV testing and counseling, and tuberculosis screening, testing and treatment. Two years after the program began, 4,756 injection drug users had been enrolled, 603,968 needles had been distributed and 252,293 needles had been removed from circulation. An evaluation of this program has been conducted and no evidence has been found that the program increases crime or encourages drug use among youth. In fact, a June 2000 study published in the *American Journal of Public Health* indicates that the needle exchange program did not increase the number or distribution of discarded needles.

Mr. Chairman, the prohibition on the District's needle exchange program is not based on sound public health policies backed up by scientific evidence, but on politics.

Exhaustive studies funded by the NIH, the CDC as well as the U.S. Surgeon General have all concluded that needle exchange programs, as part of a comprehensive HIV prevention strategy are an effective public health intervention that reduces the transmission of HIV and does not encourage the use of illegal drugs.

The District's Chief of Police, Charles Ramsey, who has been tough on illegal drug use, supports a needle exchange program for the District as a way to reduce the spread of HIV. Additionally, the needle exchange programs are supported by the American Medical Association, the National Academy of Sciences, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Bar Association, the American Nurses Association, the American Public Health Association, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials, the National Black Caucus of State Legislators, the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Mr. Chairman, when the District's needle exchange program began in 1997, by using its own funds, through 1999, the number of new HIV/AIDS cases due to intravenous drug uses has fallen more than 65 percent. This represents the most significant decline in new AIDS cases, across all transmission categories, over this time period.

Why reverse this trend? Why accept this amendment which will only continue to spread HIV and intravenous drug users will lose an important gateway to drug treatment programs?

Vote against the Tiahrt amendment.

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, our children should be protected from exposure to drug use and be kept safe from the threat of contaminated needles. For that reason, I supported the Tiahrt amendment to the Fiscal Year 2001 District of Columbia Appropriations Act. This amendment is simply a logical extension of the "Drug Free School Zone" legislation, and I urge all of you to support it as well.

The Tiahrt amendment prevents Needle Exchange Programs from existing within 1,000 feet of schools, playgrounds, day care centers, public swimming pools, and other places where children generally play. My colleagues,

by voting for this amendment we are helping to ensure that our children are not exposed to drugs, drug paraphernalia, or unnecessary health risks. Children should not have to face the risk of coming into contact with contaminated needles in the places they learn, live or play.

Simply put, this amendment is about keeping children safe. I voted "yes" on the Tiahrt amendment because "yes" is a vote for the health and safety of our children.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I believe that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and I will each take 5 minutes to summarize the vote on the underlying bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to urge those who believe in home rule for the District and recognize the kind of economic and social progress that has been achieved in the District of Columbia to vote no on this appropriations bill.

We had an opportunity to have a bill that would have sailed through conference with the Senate and would have been signed by the President. It would have been taken care of. We have got 11 appropriations bills, most of which, if not all of which, are likely to get vetoed now. Only defense and military construction have been signed. This is one that should be signed. The District of Columbia needs its money, it needs it now, and all we would do if we had the opportunity is to ask, let us pass the Senate bill.

Now, what is the difference? In the Senate bill we restore \$17 million to New York Avenue Metro station. They cannot begin that Metro station, which is a desperately needed economic development initiative, unless they have the full \$25 million. All the money has to be identified. The private sector says they will put up \$25 million, the city will put up \$25 million, they budgeted for it, all we have to put up is our own \$25 million and then we can go forward. This does not do that. This short-changes economic development.

We need \$3 million for those seniors in high school in D.C. to make the College Tuition Access Program available to everyone in a fair manner. The Mayor has asked for this money. \$3 million should be included.

We need \$3 million for Poplar Point remediation, a brownfield site. There is \$10 million in the budget, the city needs \$10 million, we only ask for \$3 million. Those are the kinds of things we ask for, plus the Tiahrt amendment, which negates a program which is working and is desperately needed in the city.

We are not asking for much. We ought to get it, get the bill signed. Why we have to go through all these motions that are so destructive and such a waste of time is beyond me.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the

ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations, to put this bill in context. Could I ask how much time is remaining?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thought that at least on this bill we would reach a compromise between the two parties. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) has described the compromise which he offered the majority party. Once again, it is my understanding that that compromise was turned down by the majority whip, or those in his office, who evidently prefer to try to pass a bill totally in the Republican image. I find that unfortunate. Two and one-half weeks before the end of the fiscal year, we ought to be looking for ways that we can agree. Instead, apparently, people are finding new ways to rehash old arguments.

Surely this fits the pattern which has been going on all year, where the Committee on Appropriations explores a compromise, but then the majority leadership says no, and gives orders to pass the bill on the Republican side alone. That results in presidential vetoes; it gets no one anywhere near a closure.

With less than 3 weeks to go, this is not the way we ought to be going. I am sorry that the majority prefers to go this way, in light of the compromise offer of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN). We could have taken either the package of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) or the Senate bill and had a perfectly reasonable compromise, but evidently we are not going to do that. So I very regrettably am going to urge a no vote on the bill.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, we have the opportunity to do the right thing. Vote no on this bill. Then we can get a bill that is acceptable to the Senate, to the White House, and, most importantly, to the citizens of the District of Columbia. We owe them that.

The citizens have elected a good mayor, they have got a good D.C. City Council, they are making progress, economic and social progress. They are not asking for much. They are asking that their kids have a chance to go to college and make it affordable. They are asking that we put up one-third of the cost of a Metro station that is desperately needed on the New York Avenue corridor. They are asking to clean up some of their brownfield sites. We have the money to do it. Let us do it. Do the right thing; vote no on the bill.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in closing debate on this bill, first I want to take the opportunity to thank the staff who have worked so hard on this: John Albaugh of my personal staff and the Committee on Appropriations; Chris Stanley, a Congressional Fellow who has been assisting in our office from the U.S. Secret Service; Mary Porter, who is detailed to us from the District Government, and I will say more about her in a moment; the committee staff for

the majority, Migo Miconi; the committee staff for the minority, Tom Forhan; and from the personal staff of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), Tim Aiken.

Each of them has put in untold hours of hard work and effort to help bring this bill to the floor, and regardless of where we may stand on different issues, I want to express my appreciation to all of them.

In regard to Mary Porter, this Fall she is retiring after 40 years of dedicated service to the District government and to our Committee. She came to the Washington area from Tennessee, worked for an insurance company until 1960 when she went to work for the District Government, and, for the last 40 years has been assisting through the Mayor's office and then on loan to Congress to follow the budget through with the city council, with the Congress, the House, the Senate, and is the undisputed expert of so many things.

So, Mary, on behalf of all the subcommittee and the Members, we appreciate your many years of hard effort. I do not know how we could tackle the technical problems we have to face, were it not for your efforts. We appreciate you and we want to thank you.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated earlier, Mary Porter has provided more than 40 years of dedicated service to the District of Columbia government and to our Committee. That is an absolutely remarkable achievement—in fact, it is almost unbelievable. For all of those years, Mary has been with the Mayor's office where the budget is prepared. She follows the budget to the Council, and then she comes to Congress and follows it through the House, the Senate and finally the House/Senate conference. She is the technical expert and without question the single most knowledgeable person at any level when it comes to all aspects of the District's budget. In every organization or office there is one person who keeps everything together and running smoothly and who knows not only what needs to be done but also what it takes to get it done. Mary Porter is that person when it comes to the District government's budget. Her technical expertise, knowledge and temperament in putting the bill and report together cannot be matched. Many times Mary has worked 18-hour days and weekends but she was always back on the job bright and early. Mary has always set high standards that others find difficult to attain.

Mary came to the District of Columbia from a little town called Deer Lodge in Tennessee in May 1954 just out of high school and found her first job with the Equitable Life Insurance Company. She worked there until the birth of her first child in 1960 when she went to work in the District government's budget office. Back then the District's total budget was \$196 million; today 40 years later it is \$3.3 billion, a 1,584 percent increase over what it was when she started. I don't believe we can blame Mary for that phenomenal increase. Mary also witnessed the evolution of the governmental structure of the District of Columbia from a three-member Presidentially-appointed commission to a single appointed mayor-commissioner with appointed city council members to an elected mayor and city council form of

government. I'm sure she could tell us first hand which form of government was the most efficient and effective in delivering services, but we will not ask her.

Mr. Chairman, there is only one Member of this House who was here when Mary first started working for the District government back in July 1960, and he is the Dean of the House. She has assisted the Committee under seven Committee Chairmen: Chairman Clarence Cannon of Missouri, Chairman Mahon, Chairman Whitten, Chairman Natcher, Chairman OBEY, Chairman Livingston, and now Chairman YOUNG. On the District of Columbia Subcommittee, she has served under Chairman Rabaut, Chairman Natcher, Chairman WILSON, Chairman DIXON, Chairman WALSH, Chairman TAYLOR, and now during my tenure. Mr. Chairman, I can attest to the fact that she is a "professional" in every sense of the word and has served chairmen and members of our subcommittee of both parties equally, providing them with her best advice and technical support.

Mr. Chairman, Mary is not one dimensional. Although she has been employed for the last 46 years, she and her husband Al have managed to raise a wonderful family. Their four children, Harvey, Lorne, Vance, and Vera are successful in their own right.

Mary, I know that I speak for the entire subcommittee and for this entire House in wishing you well in your retirement. Your 40 years with the District of Columbia government and your professionalism are a credit to our subcommittee, to the Committee and to the Congress. You are truly a remarkable person.

We all thank you very much.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISTOOK. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, that was very gracious of you to recognize the personnel that make this bill work. I should have done it. I appreciate the fact that you did it on both sides of the aisle.

I do not know what Migo Miconi is going to do without Mary Porter, but she is going to be able to spend more time in my congressional district, I trust. She has been wonderful, invaluable, and, more importantly than what Migo is going to do without her, I do not know what the Congress is going to do without her and what the citizens of the District of Columbia are going to do without her. She is a great public servant and we thank her for the great job she has done and wish her many years of health and happiness in her retirement. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman recognized her.

Mr. ISTOOK. MR. Chairman, to address the bill, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted an additional 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, it is important that we address the bill itself. I heard the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) say "Let's pass the Senate bill." Well, there is no Senate bill. The Senate is just beginning their work.

The House receives from its Budget Committee an allocation for the District, the Senate receives from its Budget Committee an allocation. There is a difference.

I think what the gentleman is referring to is that the Senate Subcommittee on the District of Columbia has been granted \$30 million more by the Senate Budget Committee than the House Subcommittee has received from its Budget Committee, and the gentleman wants that additional money. Maybe when we get to conference, some of that additional money will be added and we will have the ability to do some things the gentleman wants to do.

But the whole tenor of comments, Mr. Chairman, to say, "oh, you are not doing this for the District and you are not doing that for the District," my goodness, what is the District not doing for itself?

This bill has \$414 million in direct Federal appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia, and that is on top of the \$1.5 billion they receive from all the Federal programs in which they already participate that other communities around the country are able to participate in. This \$414 million is on top of that \$1.5 billion and it's given to the city to run their prisons, to run their court system, to run their probation and parole system.

On top of that, we have these other things, but they say it is not enough, it is not enough, it is not enough. Why? Because they say "well, we want another \$17 million for the subway project, we want another \$3 million for Poplar Point, we want another \$3 million for education."

Let me suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if the District were more diligent in conducting its duties, they would not have these problems. We have the D.C. General Hospital that this Congress has been telling the District for years you have got to get on top of that. They give a \$45 million a year annual subsidy to it, and, on top of that, they have been running a deficit of \$35 million a year for the last 3 years.

If they want to have that money, then the District ought to stop the feather bedding, the cronyism and the mismanagement at D.C. General Hospital. It is long overdue. Some people are trying to do it now, and I applaud them for it, but some others in the District are saying slow down, do not do it.

If the District wants money for these projects, why do they not get serious about internal reform? Why do they not take a look at the \$20 million that was spent on a payroll system that they have said they now have to scrap because of their incompetence in trying to get things done right? There is money, if you want to have it, for some other use.

Why do they not take the \$32 million in other reform efforts that are now in jeopardy? Why do they not look at these things, at this waste, rather than

just saying whatever you are doing Congress, it is never enough, it is never enough.

But the money they say they want for that New York Avenue Metro station, which is attracting private development money too, that money is in the bill. The \$25 million they want for it is in the bill. Their objection is saying, "oh, wait a minute, but \$18 million is coming out of this interest-bearing account held by the Control Board that is under the direction of Congress, and we want you to get it from some other account instead." Why? Because the Control Board in its last year of operation wants to double its own budget and wants to give golden parachutes to its people, instead of having that money go to the Metro station at New York Avenue.

Do not put the bug on Congress for mismanagement by the District of Columbia. There are many people working hard to correct that mismanagement and abuse, and I applaud those officials, but accept responsibility for the problems that the District brings upon itself, and do not try to shift the blame and say it is because Congress has failed to do enough.

□ 1200

Yet, we do have funds in here for the unique program that started last year to enable kids from the District of Columbia to go to college since the District does not have a State system of colleges. We have the money in here for that program. We have every penny that all estimates say are needed for the program and then some. But they still say, we want more, no matter what it is, we want more, we want more.

We have the money in here for the program of drug testing and drug treatment to a greater extent than anyplace else in the Nation, and yet, they say it is not enough. That program is Federally funded. We have not done that for Detroit, we have not done it for Cincinnati, we have not done it for Minneapolis or Phoenix or many other cities that say, we would like to have some help too. It is about time that some people in the District recognize what this Congress has done to fulfill its responsibility toward the Nation's Capital, what the people in America have supported for the Nation's Capital, and start working together instead of constantly just griping that it is never enough, no matter what we do.

We have gone above and beyond, and when we get to conference we may find that we have the ability to get a little more money to do even more. But for goodness sakes, to hear people say "vote against this bill because we are not doing enough for the District of Columbia" is nonsense. It is spin, and it is about time people got called on that spin.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good, solid, responsible bill. It moves reform in the District of Columbia, it requires accountability, it puts a stop to this end-

less drain by D.C. General Hospital that if left unchecked will take the city back into insolvency. It requires strengthening of the charter schools which education bureaucrats are trying to strangle right now, even as parents are saying, "I want my kids in this charter school because it is a public school that gives them an opportunity instead of being trapped in a dead end, nonperforming, dangerous school," as many of them are now stuck in.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a bill to take care of the needs of the District of Columbia, to move along reform in the District of Columbia, and to promote responsibility and futures of hope, growth and opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to include in the RECORD an article on mismanagement and other serious problems, including what some might consider medical malpractice, at DC General Hospital. The article was the cover story in the August 18, 2000 edition of the Washington City Paper.

[From the Washington City Paper, Aug. 18-24, 2000]

FIRST, DO NO HARM

(By Stephanie Mencimer)

When some D.C. General Hospital doctors talk about putting patients first, they're not being Hippocratic. They're being hypocritical.

About a year and a half ago, an inmate from the D.C. Department of Corrections came to D.C. General Hospital for hernia surgery. He hadn't seen his surgeon, Dr. Norma Smalls, in at least a month. But when the man arrived for his procedure, Smalls didn't do a fresh pre-op physical exam—a step that most surgeons regard as routine. Instead, according to former Chief Medical Officer Ronald David and three other hospital sources, Smalls just had the man put under anesthesia and then cut him open—on the wrong side of his body.

Finding no hernia, David says, Smalls walked out of the operating room, wrote some notes in the charges, and then looked over the medical records. Realizing her mistake, Smalls had her patient anesthetized once more and cut him open again.

Fortunately, the patient recovered. Still, such a "sentinel event," as a blunder like wrong-side surgery is known in the hospital business, is a very big deal, as serious a hospital disaster as an abducted baby or a rape by a staff member. The reason, of course, is that the kind of mistakes that lead to wrong-side hernia operations can lead to amputating the wrong leg or removing a healthy kidney.

If D.C. General were a normal hospital, Smalls' blunder would have come under intense scrutiny. The Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations (JCAHO) requires hospital medical staff to conduct a "root-cause analysis" of any wrong-side surgery and to implement an action plan to prevent such incidents from recurring. A hospital's accreditation is partly based on how its medical staff handles sentinel events.

Initially, though, the medical staff wasn't even planning to investigate Smalls' wrong-side surgery, according to David. When pressed by the administration, a committee made up of the chief of surgery, the chief of anesthesiology, and the head of the nursing staff eventually did review each department's role in the case. The nursing administration promptly fired a nurse who was found to be partially culpable. The doctors, however, found no problem with Smalls' per-

formance in the operating room. Dr. Richard Holt, the hospital's chief of surgery, would not comment on the case.

Smalls declined to discuss the surgery other than to say, "I am a physician and citizen of high ethical standards," and that the JCAHO, the hospital accrediting body, was satisfied with the hospital's review process. "I have reams of documentation to show how well that was done," she says.

Nonetheless, the story of Smalls' surgical mistake spread through the hospital like a staph infection, raising eyebrows among nurses and other technical staff members who had heard constant rumors about her competency, according to several hospital sources. But that didn't stop the physicians from later electing Smalls as president of the D.C. General medical/dental staff. And today, she is head of quality assurance for the hospital's department of surgery.

Smalls and some of her colleagues on the D.C. General medical staff have been among the loudest voices complaining about the many problems ailing the District's only public hospital. They have taken their complaints about the hospital administration to the mayor, to the D.C. Council, and directly to Congress. They have demanded the ouster of former CEO John Fairman and even summoned various investigative agencies to scrutinize the hospital, which has run up \$109 million in budget overruns and is at risk of being closed down completely.

Patients themselves are deserting the hospital in droves: More than 90 percent of Medicaid patients and 97 percent of Medicare patients now go to other, private D.C. hospitals, as do two-thirds of the city's 80,000 uninsured residents, according to D.C. Department of Health figures.

Yet during all the recent debate over the future of the city's ailing public health system, few people have ever stopped to ask whether Smalls and some of her medical colleagues might themselves be part of the problem.

For years, the medical staff has eluded the demands for accountability that have slowly started to take hold in other parts of D.C. government. Instead, the doctors have successfully portrayed themselves as the lone champions of health care for the poor, which is the one thing that D.C. General inarguably dispenses.

Yet internal memos from the D.C. Health and Hospitals Public Benefit Corp. (PBC), the body that oversees the public hospital and its clinics, show that far from improving patient care, Smalls and some of the elected leadership of the medical staff have fought to overturn disciplinary actions against poorly performing physicians and defend doctors' shoddy work habits. Even as they have complained about the quality of the nursing staff and hospital administrators, many of the physicians have fought off requirements to update their own skills, see more patients, and otherwise raise the standards of D.C. public health care. Moreover, past and present hospital administrators say that a vocal minority of those same doctors have played a key role in obstructing the very reforms that might put the PBC on better financial footing.

Deairich Hunter is the PBC's former chief of staff and a former staff member for Ward 8 Councilmember Sandy Allen, chair of the Health and Human Services Committee, which oversees the PBC. When he worked for the council, Hunter spent much of his time trying to save D.C. General. When he came to work for the PBC last year, though, he says, "I started to wonder what it was that I was saving."

To be sure, many of the 170 doctors who work for the PBC are devoted professionals who have a real commitment to public

health care and labor under difficult circumstances. But then there are the others: the twice-bankrupt, many-times-sued OB-GYN and the former chief of trauma who allegedly saw only eight patients in a month, despite being paid for full-time work.

The city's doctors are emboldened by the same civil-service protections that make all D.C. government employees nearly impossible to fire, and they are largely immune from outside accreditation investigators, who evaluate hospital procedures, not physician competency. Duly insulated, the PBC's doctors have successfully chased out reform-minded administrators who have attempted to rein them in. "Using a good offense as their best defense, the medical staff has avoided accountability for years," says one hospital administrator, who wishes to remain anonymous.

The bureaucrats' attack on reformers is a time-honored D.C. government tradition. Such behavior has made city agencies like the Department of Motor Vehicles merely infuriating, but in a hospital, the consequences can be deadly. It's no surprise that even as D.C. councilmembers go to bat for the jobs of city doctors, the poorest city residents are taking their business elsewhere.

Last August, D.C. General OB-GYN John S. Selden III featured prominently in a front-page story in the *New York Times* about racial disparities among women who die in childbirth. "Most obstetricians are afraid to talk about losing patients," the story read. "But the doctors at D.C. General are surprisingly direct. Dr. John S. Selden, who has worked at the hospital on and off for the last 13 years, told of a death that occurred just a few months ago." The woman Selden described died on the operating table, moments after a Caesarean section at D.C. General.

Selden was something of an odd choice for the hospital to offer up as a national expert. Had the *Times* interviewed some of his former patients, the paper might have discovered that Selden has a somewhat blemished record as a physician. But his story helps illustrate why some doctors at D.C. General are often so militant about protecting their jobs.

In the past 20 years, Selden has been sued at least six times, racking up some huge settlements. In 1984, Selden treated a pregnant woman named Vanessa Black who had come to Greater Southeast Community Hospital suffering from vaginal bleeding. Selden discharged her the next day with instructions for strict bed rest, without determining whether it was safe for her to move. Black was still spotting, and a day later, she went into labor, had a emergency C-section because of hemorrhaging, and delivered a brain-damaged baby. In 1993, Greater Southeast settled a suit filed by Black's family for \$1.3 million.

Another case is currently pending, filed by Cherif Abraham Haidara, alleging that during a 1997 delivery at D.C. General, Selden caused traumatic nerve injury to her baby's arm, rendering the arm useless. In this case, the family isn't likely to get a dime if it prevails in court, because Selden has no assets to speak of, having filed for bankruptcy protection twice in the past 15 years. And at the time of Haidara's delivery, he had no malpractice insurance.

Ordinarily, as a city employee, Selden wouldn't have needed malpractice insurance, because he would have been insured by the District. But Selden was working at D.C. General on a contract with the Medical Services Group, a private practice consisting of several OB-GYNs who had retired from D.C. General in 1995 and had immediately gotten a \$2.9 million emergency contract from the hospital. The contract allowed the doctors to earn significantly more than they would

have as hospital employees. After the Office of the D.C. Auditor criticized the contract for various improprieties, the hospital canceled it in 1997.

D.C. General provided most of the group's clients, so when it canceled the contract, the practice shut down. During that last year, when Haidara's baby was born, the Medical Services Group doctors were carrying no malpractice insurance. They blamed the city, which they claimed was supposed to pay for the insurance. (The doctors are currently suing the District over the issue.)

According to his deposition in the Haidara case, Selden remained unemployed for about a year after his practice collapsed, and he eventually filed for bankruptcy protection. Later, he went to work for Planned Parenthood for about six months before D.C. General rehired him in March of last year.

Selden could not be reached for comment. Given Selden's history, it might seem strange that D.C. General would be eager to have him back. But thanks to city pay-scale restrictions, the hospital is fairly desperate for specialists like OB-GYNs, whom it needs to maintain its accreditation. D.C. law bars city employees from making more than the mayor's salary, which for most of the 1990s was about \$90,000. The going salary for an OB-GYN in the private sector is nearly \$300,000. (The mayor's salary has since gone up, to about \$120,000, but doctors' salaries have remained capped at \$99,000.)

Lawrence Johnson, the medical director at D.C. General for 15 years until 1997, says the salary cap has always been problematic in keeping the hospital staffed up. "We couldn't keep a full-time specialist in some cases," he says, adding that the hospital has always relied on a patchwork quilt of coverage. "It's not the kind of arrangement that lends itself to building stability."

The PBC's poor pay—among the worst in the nation—combined with difficult working conditions and old-fashioned crony politics has helped make D.C. General a virtual dumping ground for troubled doctors. Alongside doctors like Selden, the hospital employs physicians who have left other troubled city facilities, like the D.C. Jail and the old city-run nursing home, D.C. Village, which was closed after a suit by the Justice Department, following the deaths of more than 30 residents from poor medical care.

Another of the hospital's former medical directors is Dr. William Hall, former Mayor Marion S. Barry Jr.'s longtime eye doctor, who was the medical director of the D.C. Department of Corrections when the jail medical services landed in receivership for abysmal treatment of inmates in 1995. A federal judge seized control of the services shortly after an inmate with AIDS died while tied to a wheelchair, where he has sat in his own feces, neglected, for several days. Hall went on to do a brief stint as D.C. General's medical director and is still employed at the hospital as an ophthalmologist.

Conventional wisdom holds that the trauma surgeons at D.C. General are among the hospital's best doctors, because of their experience in handling life-threatening gunshot wounds and other medical crises. Despite their reputation, though, no data exist to prove whether D.C. General trauma surgeons are any better than, say, Washington Hospital Center's. And there's some evidence to suggest that they might be worse.

In 1995, an ambulance transported a transgendered man, Tyrone Michael (aka Tyra) Hunter, to the emergency room at D.C. General, where he later died after doctors failed to drain blood that had pooled near his heart, according to a lawsuit filed by Hunter's mother, Margie Hunter. Her lawyer, Richard Silber, learned during the litigation that Joseph Bastien, the trauma surgeon

who had treated Hunter in the emergency room, had flunked his surgical board exams three times and was not certified as a surgeon.

In fact, out of the eight attending physicians in the trauma unit at the time, five were not board-certified, including the unit's acting chief, Dr. Paul Oriaifo. (Two of those noncertified doctors still work at the hospital.) In 1998, a jury awarded Margie Hunter \$2.3 million, and the city last week settled the case for \$1.75 million.

Silber says he was astonished at the poor qualifications of some of the trauma surgeons at D.C. General. "There are terrific public hospitals in this country. Just because they are public doesn't mean they have to have incompetent care," he notes.

It's 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday, July 5, and already the D.C. General orthopedic clinic is full of people on crutches or in wheelchairs, or sporting casts, slings, or metal staples in their knees. A man in a wheelchair with a full head rack and pins keeping his neck straight closes his eyes and exhales slowly. Almost 50 people have arrived in the basement of the hospital. Kenneth Reid, here for his broken knee, knows he's in for a long wait.

"Last time I was here, I had a 9 a.m. appointment, and I didn't get done until 4," Reid says.

The clinic is open only on Mondays and Wednesdays, and the staff schedules patients for appointments between 8 a.m. and 10:30 a.m. Even then, it's first come, first served. So people line up early and then hunker down in front of the TV. With luck, they'll get their blood pressure taken by the time Bob Barker wraps up *The Price Is Right*. If you feel really bad, Reid says, you can go to the emergency room.

Or you can employ Monica Parker's strategy: the fake faint. Parker, who recently broke both her legs, says she once got so tired of waiting that she staged a collapse on the way to the ladies' room. "I got right in," she says with a laugh. "You got to fall out right where everyone can see."

An elderly man who gives his name only as Oscar, who has been waiting almost a year for surgery on his hip, knows the system pretty well. "The whole thing is not to have the doctors waiting to see the patients," he explains.

There's no chance any doctors will be waiting today. Medical residents doing training as part of the Howard University Medical School do most of the work here, but they haven't arrived yet. That's because on Wednesday mornings, the residents have to attend a meeting at Howard University Hospital. They usually don't show up at the clinic until 10 a.m., even though patients have been sitting here for two hours by then. And as for the staff doctors, well, none of the patients seem to know when they get in.

Oscar says the attending physicians alternate covering the clinic because most of them also work somewhere else. Elaborating some common hospital folklore, Oscar explains confidently, "The hospital can't afford to pay doctors for 40 hours a week." The hospital does in fact pay the clinic's attending physicians almost \$100,000 annually for full-time work, but conversations with other patients make it easy to see how Oscar came to that conclusion.

While dozens of patients watch Maury Povich berating moms for dressing so sexy that they embarrass their children, a woman in a bright-red dress and heels storms out of the clinic door, cursing the people behind Booth 2. She comes back later and throws herself into a chair. "I had three appointments. They made me come in. The doctor wasn't here," fumes Mary E. Muschette. "This is the fourth appointment. One day I

was here at 7:30 and left at 3 after I found out that they had discharged me without seeing me. I've made this appointment since April for a jammed finger. Every time I've been here, no doctor." Muschette says she is supposed to see a specialist, but adds, "He's never here. If I had a job and did that, I'd be in trouble."

Muschette's furious tirade is more entertaining than Povich, and it sets off a round of complaints and affirmations from the other patients. "I never see the doctor who signs the prescriptions," Parker says, "I've only seen him once, and that was at Howard. He is on all my paperwork, though."

Dr. Easton Manderson, the chief of orthopedics, is himself the subject of patient complaints about scheduling. An inmate at Lorton, David Spencer, is currently suing Manderson in federal court for allegedly bumping him off the surgical schedule for more than a year, delaying a bone graft on his arm and, he says, causing partial paralysis. Spencer filed the suit pro se, but a federal judge believed Spencer had a strong enough complaint that he took the unusual step of appointing a lawyer to represent Spencer.

But Manderson is a busy man. Along with his full-time job at D.C. General, he also has two private practices. On Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Fridays, and some Saturdays, he works at his Providence Hospital office. Then, on Tuesdays after 5 p.m., he works at his Eastern Avenue office in Maryland. Yet Manderson managed to collect \$23,866 in overtime at D.C. General last year, according to documents provided by the PBC.

Manderson disputes this figure, and in a letter to the Washington City Paper, he said he spends only 12 of the 72 hours he works each week at his private office.

"I perform more surgery and see more patients than any other surgeon at D.C. General," Manderson said in his letter.

Moonlighting by full-time PBC doctors is a common practice, which the doctors justify because of their low salaries, and there's no rule against it. But the doctors are still expected to fulfill their duties for the PBC. It's clear from the stories at the orthopedic clinic, however, that the hospital is not getting its money's worth from some of its physicians.

The experience of the orthopedic patients was backed up in a recent review by Cambio Health Solutions, a consulting firm brought in by the PBC to analyze the hospital's management problems. Cambio found that doctors' overtime billing was based on the honor system and that the PBC had no system to document how much time doctors actually worked on behalf of the PBC. "Productivity standards are not existent," the consultants wrote. An operational review found that clinics failed to start on time because most of the physicians had practices in other parts of the District.

Absentee doctors are problematic for a variety of reasons. Medical residents, because of their junior status, can't sign any of the paperwork needed for billing, so patients routinely leave their charts with a physician's assistant whose job it is to track down the attending doctors for their signatures. As the paperwork stacks up, patients are often left waiting for weeks to get disability claims filed, for instance. Or, as happened in Oscar's case, the signature problem can delay treatment.

Oscar says that every time he comes in to the clinic, staffers treat him like a new patient and repeat the same tests, because they can't find his medical records. The doctors' failure to keep up on the paperwork also takes a financial toll on the hospital itself, because it can't bill for services unless physicians document them—a problem highlighted by consultants from Cambio.

For years, the PBC doctors have gotten away with such poor performance because they could count on their patients to keep quiet. Parker, for example, says that even though she usually plans to wait between five and 12 hours whenever she comes to the clinic, it would never occur to her to complain to hospital officials. "I'm not going to cuss you out about not getting what I pay for when I'm not paying anything," she says. Besides, she adds, "Nobody else will take me."

When she broke her legs—she tripped in the grass while walking in high heels—Parker says she was taken to Howard. But when the hospital discovered she didn't have insurance, it sent her by ambulance to D.C. General. "If I could go somewhere else, I would," she says.

For years, D.C. General patients have told horror stories about being unwittingly operated on by what they call "ghost doctors"—unsupervised residents who have not yet completed their medical training. In a place where such legends are as common as bedpans, most malpractice lawyers and others who regularly heard the stories never quite believed them. But Debra Burton says that, in her case at least, not only is the legend true, she can prove it.

In November 1992, Burton saw Manderson, the orthopedic surgeon, at Providence Hospital on a referral from a doctor at Howard University Hospital, who believed she needed surgery to have a bone spur removed from her foot. Burton says she saw Manderson for "about five minutes." She says he agreed to do the surgery but told her she had to have it done at D.C. General. So on Jan. 21, 1993, Burton checked into D.C. General, gave her Medicaid information, and was headed for the operating room when, she says, residents told her that Manderson wasn't at the hospital but was on his way.

Burton had the surgery, but she never did see Manderson. A few months later, she was still in excruciating pain. After several more visits to other doctors, Burton learned several startling facts: A nerve had been cut in her foot, but the bone spur was still here. And, most troubling, Burton says, she learned that Manderson hadn't actually performed—or supervised—the surgery as promised. Instead, she had been operated on by a couple of residents—doctors in training.

Burton has been disabled by the pain and unable to work ever since. She had hoped to file a malpractice suit, but she says her lawyer botched the case, and she eventually reported him to legal disciplinary authorities. She didn't give up, though. Burton has been on a mission ever since to find some justice, and she has collected an assortment of documentation about her case.

Among her papers is a 1997 letter Manderson wrote to the D.C. Board of Medicine in response to a complaint Burton filed against him. In the letter, Manderson claims he never told Burton he would take her as a private patient, but that "I would arrange to have her surgery done at D.C. General." However, Manderson's name appears on all Burton's D.C. General records as the admitting and attending physician, and her admission and consent form states that she agreed to surgery that would either be performed or supervised by Easton Manderson.

Ronald David, the hospital's former chief medical officer, says that at D.C. General, attending physicians of record are expected to be responsible for their patients before, during, and after surgery—guidelines also specified by the American College of Surgeons.

In his letter to the medical board, Manderson maintains that even if he had agreed to do the surgery, he was not required to be in the operating room when residents were operating. He repeated this claim in his

letter to the City Paper. In fact, in 1995, two years after Burton's surgery, D.C. General almost lost its Medicaid accreditation for, among other things, allowing residents to operate unsupervised, according to reports in the Washington Post. And David says, "If he is the attending of record, he was supposed to be there." Nevertheless, the board of medicine dismissed the complaint without any further investigation.

When she discovered that Manderson had billed Medicaid for part of the procedure, Burton filed a complaint with the city. Doctors at D.C. General are salaried employees and may not bill Medicaid individually for services they provide there; Medicaid pays the hospital directly. But Manderson and another doctor whom Burton claims she never saw both billed and were paid for services related to her surgery. In 1998, according to a letter sent to Burton in response to her complaint, the Medicaid office sought to recoup the money for what it called "erroneous billing." No investigation was ever launched. PBC officials declined any comment on Manderson's practice at D.C. General.

On Jan. 15, 1998, 93-year-old Ernest Higgins ran a stop sign at 10th and Constitution NE and was hit by a truck. He was admitted to D.C. General by trauma surgeon Dr. Chinwe Agugua suffering from some swelling on the side of his neck, but otherwise, he didn't have any other obvious injuries. The hospital kept him overnight for observation, and the next morning a nurse called Higgins' son, Daniel Higgins, and told him to come to take his father home.

The lifelong Washingtonian and former auto-parts store owner had been active for his advanced age, and his medical records even noted that he lived alone in a two-story house at 18th and Franklin Streets NE and was fully able to care for himself. But before Ernest Higgins was discharged, a nurse had to carry him to the bathroom.

"I thought this was odd, since the day before, he had been driving," says Daniel Higgins. As it turned out, his father couldn't walk, but no one at the hospital seemed to think this was unusual, so Higgins took him home. "I checked on him after [The Tonight Show], and he was sleeping. The next morning when I got up, he had passed away," he says. An autopsy revealed that the elder Higgins had suffered two broken vertebrae in his neck and had died from a major spinal-cord injury.

The Higgins family decided to pursue legal action against the hospital. They went to three different lawyers before the last one told them—wrongly—that they would never be able to collect any money from the broke D.C. government, and in any event, because Ernest Higgins had been so old, there wouldn't be much in the way of damages to recover. Before they had a chance to pursue the case further, the statute of limitations for filing a suit ran out. Still, Higgins' granddaughter continued to demand that the PBC investigate the handling of the case, but she never got an answer. Dr. Richard Holt, who had been Higgins' attending physician, said last month in an interview that he did not remember Higgins.

Doctors who work for the PBC are protected by civil service rules and the hospital's peer review committees. As the Higgins case demonstrates, they are also largely insulated from scrutiny by the most effective, if de facto, medical regulators: malpractice attorneys.

Higgins' claim was one of 17 notices sent to the District government since January 1998 declaring intentions to sue the hospital for wrongful deaths. Of those, 12 cases never went to court, including the Higgins case. Some were denied because the potential plaintiff failed to adhere to the strict filing

timetable required under D.C. law. Anyone intending to sue D.C. General must notify the city within six months of the alleged malpractice. A lawsuit in a wrongful-death case must then be filed within a year; other malpractice cases must be filed within three years.

Diane Littlepage, a malpractice attorney in Baltimore who has successfully sued D.C. General, says that very few people are able to make the six-month deadline, which doesn't exist for private hospitals. In addition, attorneys generally don't regard D.C. General patients as attractive clients. That's because wrongful-death awards are based on the value of a person's life, which a civil suit reduces to a cold calculus of economic activity and life expectancy. If a patient was poor or unemployed, or had any kind of lifestyle issues that might shorten life span, such as criminal activity or drug abuse—all common issues with many D.C. General patients—that patient's life doesn't add up to much in a lawsuit.

Malpractice cases are also extremely costly to litigate, so lawyers who do take them pick up only clients whose potential awards will more than cover the costs of trying the case. Bill Lightfoot, a prominent malpractice attorney and former D.C. councilmember, says he routinely spends \$50,000 to \$100,000 to litigate a wrongful-death case.

Because of the lawyers' informal vetting system, when malpractice suits do go forward against doctors at D.C. General, they are fairly serious. Here are a few recent examples:

Tammara Kilgore, 22, arrived at D.C. General on April 26, 1998, suffering from nausea, fever, and highly abnormal liver functions. Doctors allegedly diagnosed Kilgore with a urinary-tract infection—without performing a urinalysis—gave her some antibiotics, and sent her home, according to the suit filed by her family. Kilgore died a few days later from liver failure stemming from hepatitis.

Darryl Kelley, 19, arrived at D.C. General suffering from a gunshot wound to the face in February 1997. The bullet had broken his jaw, but he could talk, swallow, and breathe. Dr. Norma Smalls did exploratory surgery on his neck and put a tube in his windpipe so he could be hooked up to a ventilator after oral surgeons wired his teeth together. Two days later, Kelly was dead—but not from the bullet wound. An autopsy later showed that he had suffocated to death from a blockage in the tracheotomy tube. On April 11 of this year, the city settled a wrongful-death suit brought by Kelley's family for \$175,000.

In November 1998, Gloria Porter, 50, was admitted to D.C. General to have a benign polyp removed from her duodenum. Instead of just removing the polyp, Dr. Paramjeet Sabharwal and two residents allegedly performed a risky surgery designed for excising advanced cancer, removing her gall bladder, part of her duodenum, and part of her pancreas. A week later, Porter, who didn't have cancer, died from a massive hemorrhage—a complication of the surgery—according to a suit filed by her daughter last August.

Bruce Klores, one of the city's leading malpractice attorneys, who has won several large verdicts against D.C. General, says that the hospital has "probably the most underreported malpractice of any hospital in the city."

When David accepted the position of chief medical officer for the PBC in 1997, he was looking forward to having a hand in patient care once again. For the previous six years, he had been teaching health policy at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government. Before that, he had served as deputy secretary of health, and then acting secretary of health, under Pennsylvania Gov.

Robert P. Casey. An African-American neonatologist and pediatrician who grew up in a mean South Bronx neighborhood, David was an idealist who believed passionately in the public service aspect of medicine.

But David quickly discovered that D.C. General was like no place he had ever experienced. To be sure, it had the usual problems of any public hospital: too little money, insufficient equipment and supplies, and an aging building that was suffering from disrepair. But that wasn't what he found most troubling about the place.

When David arrived at D.C. General, he recounts in an interview, as patients waited hours upon hours in the emergency room, doctors were not coming to work on time, they were leaving early, and they were often sleeping on the job, in part because they were working full-time jobs elsewhere. The celebrated trauma surgeons refused to see other, "ordinary" emergency room patients who weren't suffering from major injuries such as gunshot wounds, even when those surgeons weren't busy with other patients.

After interviewing patients, David also discovered that some of the OB-GYNs were skimming off patients with insurance and Medicaid, sending them to their private-practice offices and delivering their babies at other hospitals, where doctors could bill the insurers or Medicaid for their services. "In some instances, doctors would actively dissuade patients from going to D.C. General," says David. "We had patients tell us that doctors had told them not to come back."

He also found that doctors weren't showing up on time for clinics and were occasionally working in their private practices when they were expected to be at D.C. General. About six months after David took over as chief medical officer, someone in the emergency room paged Manderson, who was supposed to be on duty. The page was returned by a nurse at Providence Hospital, who said Manderson wasn't available because he was in surgery.

The event was one of a long line of problems that prompted David to draw up a memo in which he told the medical/dental staff that he would be giving them a one-month amnesty period in which to clean up their act. After that, he told the doctors, they would be disciplined severely for a number of practices that had long been tolerated at the hospital.

In the amnesty memo, David told doctors that he expected them to work the hours that they were scheduled and paid for and that they were recording on their time sheets. He barred them from doing union work or private-practice work during regular hours and then working for the PBC afterward to collect overtime.

He required the full-time community health center staff to show up five days a week. He demanded that surgeons be in the operating room to supervise surgeries and that they be available to the patients immediately before and after surgery for follow-up. He barred doctors from ordering supplies and equipment for use in their private offices. And he asked that they fill out medical records on time.

Finally, David warned that if he caught any physicians collecting insurance information from PBC clients for the purpose of sending paying patients to their private offices, they would be in serious trouble. In his memo, David wrote, "Please know that my intent is to hold us to high standards of performance and integrity despite the prevailing political and economic forces that serve to undermine the PBC. I will not allow us to assume the role of victims."

Although David's demands seem rather basic—things one would expect from competent doctors who care about patients—the D.C. General medical staff was outraged. The doctors declared war on David.

Leading the charge against David was Oriaifo, then the acting head of trauma and later president of the medical/dental staff. A charismatic Nigerian who went to medical school in the former Soviet Union, Oriaifo had been active in the doctors' union at the hospital, where he has worked for the past 16 years. David and Oriaifo first butted heads when David removed Oriaifo as acting chief of trauma and placed the trauma unit under the supervision of Dr. Howard Freed, the new director of emergency medicine.

The demotion prompted Oriaifo to call an emergency meeting of the medical/dental staff, alleging that he had been persecuted for speaking out about the administration's failure to support clinicians. In a memo to the PBC board, Oriaifo claimed that Freed was not qualified to supervise him because Freed wasn't a surgeon.

In fact, Freed was the first person ever to run D.C. General's emergency department who had been both trained and board-certified in emergency medicine. He had more than 20 years of experience working in trauma centers and fixing troubled emergency rooms.

Oriaifo, on the other hand, is not board-certified in surgery or any other specialty. Furthermore, under his leadership, the hospital's trauma unit has lost its Level 1 trauma designation from the American College of Surgeons—a designation that qualifies a trauma center to treat the most severe cases. (Oriaifo blames this loss on a lack of institutional support from the PBC, not any shortcomings of his leadership.) Nonetheless, Oriaifo soon got his job back after Mayor Barry intervened on his behalf.

Undaunted, David continued to discipline wayward doctors. He suspended and later fired a doctor for failing to complete medical records; he demoted a podiatrist who had refused to treat inmates and who the nursing staff had complained wasn't starting clinics on time. After he discovered what outside consultants would later confirm—that the hospital had too many managers—David also demoted a physician who had been getting extra pay as the administrator of the "Neurology Department," which had only two doctors in it.

David really angered the medical staff when he started showing up early at hospital clinics to see whether the doctors were at work on time. Nurses had complained that one particular doctor's tardiness was pushing a clinic to stay open later in the afternoon, requiring the hospital to pay the nurses overtime. David caught the doctor red-handed, contacting her on her cell phone. She was dropping her kids off at school an hour and a half after she was supposed to be at the clinic.

The personal investigators prompted Oriaifo to stand up at a PBC board meeting one day and protest that David was "spying" on the doctors, which he said the staff considered highly inappropriate for the chief medical officer. David says Oriaifo didn't get much sympathy from the board.

Oriaifo and the elected medical leadership defended the disciplined doctors, claiming that they had been singled out for criticizing the PBC. The medical staff believes itself to be an independent governing body under city law, and it often argues that only staff doctors can discipline other doctors, even for administrative rather than clinical matters. As a result, the group has tried to overturn many disciplinary actions imposed by the hospital administration.

In a 1998 memo to the PBC board complaining about David, Oriaifo wrote: "Dr. David has done nothing to support the practitioners as we struggle to render care to our patients. . . . For all intents and purposes, and based on all available credible evidence,

Dr. Ronald David appears to be a clueless enforcer and not a leader. WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?" A month later, Oriaifo helped organize the first of two votes of no confidence against David. The votes were largely symbolic, but they constituted a direct demand by the doctors to the PBC to oust David.

In an interview, Oriaifo contended that David was a failure as an administrator because he was an outsider: "Ron David just blew out of Harvard. What does he know about D.C. General?"

Nevertheless, David held on to his job. When PBC board member Victor Freeman, the medical director for quality for INOVA Health Care, voiced his support for David's actions, the medical staff attacked Freeman, too. In a letter dated Feb. 3, 1999, Oriaifo wrote to Bette Catoe, the chair of the PBC board, complaining about Freeman. "How many more victims will be claimed by this scorched-earth, slash-and-burn, take-no-prisoner tactics before someone acts to stop the madness?" Oriaifo wrote. "WE ARE FRIGHTENED. . . . We are UNDER SIEGE. We are at the brink of cataclysm. . . . PLEASE HEAR MY CRY, PLEASE HEED MY CRY!"

David says his critics were mostly interested in covering up their malfeasance and laziness. "They threw up smoke screens," he says, noting that they went after anyone who tried to discipline them. For example, David says, as Freed put pressure on the emergency-room doctors to be more productive and see more patients, they responded by calling in the D.C. Office of the Inspector General, filing sexual harassment and discrimination charges against him with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Despite the doctors' resistance—and the dire warnings from the medical staff that the hospital was on the brink of disaster—David says Freed managed to reduce waiting times in the emergency room by better than 50 percent.

Finally, David attempted to put to rest the constant rumors about the surgical competency of Smalls. In March 1999, the JCAHO had approved the hospital's procedures for reviewing Smalls' wrong-side surgery. But the agency evaluated only the process, not the outcome, with which David was still dissatisfied. So he consulted Freeman, the PBC board's quality-assurance expert, and they decided to send the case to an impartial committee of physicians from the D.C. Medical Society.

Late last summer, the medical society found significant problems with the surgery, which David used as justification to review some of Smalls' past cases. He also ordered the doctors to create an action plan that would prevent such mistakes in the future. In the end, though, David says, his effort to compel the doctors to discipline themselves amounted to very little. Forcing them to put the patients' interests before their own, says David, was a monumental fight.

When he first came to D.C. General, David says, he sustained faith in the miracles performed at the hospital, where he found that most doctors managed to do good work under very difficult conditions. For a while, he had even felt comfortable bringing his wife there for treatment for sickle-cell anemia. But when the medical staff failed to institute an effective peer-review system, David decided that he couldn't maintain high standards at the hospital. He resigned last September. In a few weeks, he will be entering a seminary, where he hopes to learn some language of healing to bring to the practice of medicine. "It was just so dispiriting," David says of his time at D.C. General.

After David left as chief medical officer, Dr. Robin Newton, a popular doctor who had recently been the president of the medical/dental staff, took over. She continued to pursue David's quality objectives, and in February of this year, the hospital fired Oriaifo.

For many years, Oriaifo had also held a job at Providence Hospital, and the PBC administration believed he wasn't putting in the time he was being paid for at D.C. General. An audit concluded that Oriaifo had seen only eight patients while working 24 hours a week from Oct. 15 to Nov. 15 of last year. Oriaifo disputed the veracity of the audit, and the medical staff organized a vote of support for him. Then the doctors called in the JCAHO, which sent surprise inspectors into the hospital in early March, prompting yet another crisis for the beleaguered institution.

Oriaifo has since filed a \$1 million whistleblower suit against the PBC, contending that he was fired for criticizing the hospital management, which he alleges retaliated against him, even going so far as to revoke his reserved-parking privileges. "When you give your whole life to a service and you end it with a kick in the pants, it hurts," he says.

Oriaifo says he was only looking out for patient care, calling attention to the administration's failure to respond to doctors' complaints about a CT scanner that broke down twice a week, defibrillators that malfunctioned regularly, and incompetent nurses in the trauma center. He says the hospital has seen its patient count dwindle by 20,000 since 1995 because the emergency room has been closed down repeatedly for lack of beds. "Is it your fault when people say you're not productive? The problem is not the employees. The problem is leadership and management," Oriaifo contends.

To make his points, he has charts he sent to the PBC board outlining a proposed reorganization of the emergency department and memos with long lists of complaints about poor management. In the course of an interview in which Oriaifo talks almost nonstop for three hours, it becomes clear that he believes that he personally should be running the hospital. "I, Paul Oriaifo, was one of the doctors who received [Capitol shooter] Russell Weston! I was running the service of excellence!" he says, gesticulating wildly. "We [staff doctors] are the main engine of the PBC. We revolutionized that hospital. We are victims here."

Since Oriaifo's departure, the PBC's medical staff has directed its attacks at Newton. On July 3, Dr. Michal Young, the new president of the medical/dental staff, wrote to the PBC board complaining that Newton had, among other wrongdoings, ignored Oriaifo's request to volunteer in the trauma unit. (Oriaifo has offered to volunteer 20 hours a week in the trauma unit because of his "deep commitment" to the hospital. He also admits that by doing so, he would be able to keep his leadership job with the elected medical staff.)

Perhaps Newton's biggest offense in the eyes of the doctors, however, was her support for legislation in the D.C. Council that would have designated the doctors "at-will" employees—which would have made them much easier to fire. (The legislation was withdrawn after a flurry of lobbying by the medical staff.) Late last month, the medical staff staged a vote of no confidence against Newton.

Meanwhile, all the complaining by the medical staff has had an effect in one respect, at least: Former CEO John Fairman has been removed, and now everyone from the General Accounting Office to Congress is scrutinizing the PBC. But the end result may not be exactly what the doctors had in mind.

The PBC is preparing to lay off hundreds of workers, including doctors, to avert a shut-

down of the hospital entirely. Services to the poor will likely be severely curtailed. Trauma surgeons are in all likelihood going to be phased out altogether. Their special designation as an independent unit within the emergency department—which has other surgeons on which to draw—was always an anomaly, and outside consultants found them to be vastly inefficient.

And in the end, the people who are going to suffer the most are the city's poor and uninsured—the very people the medical staff has claimed to be standing up for all along.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote *aye* on this bill.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4942, the District of Columbia appropriations bill.

As reported by the Appropriations Committee, this bill contains an appropriation that is \$22 million below last year's funding level. Additionally, this bill provides 7 percent less funding than the District requested. But Mr. Speaker, what bothers me the most about this bill is its inherently undemocratic nature. H.R. 4942 contains dozens of general provisions that preempt local decision-making power from the District and redistribute it to the Federal Government. Through these unnecessary and burdensome provisions, this legislation undermines local control and intrudes into the internal affairs of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4942 contains numerous underfunded priorities, including the following cuts from last year's levels and the administration's requests:

A \$3 million reduction in the fiscal year 2000 funding level for the program that assists District of Columbia students who must pay out-of-state college tuition costs. This funding cut is particularly insidious because the District is not a state, and therefore local high school graduates do not have the access to a state system of higher education offered to students in the rest of the country. Education must be one of our highest priorities as a nation, and this bill neglects that goal.

No funds for adoption incentives for children in the District of Columbia foster care system. The administration requested \$5 million for this priority, which helps remove children from the foster care system while seeking to place them with a loving and stable family.

In addition to the concerns about funding levels, H.R. 4942 includes a number of legislative riders, several of which have been attached to the bill in prior years. I support the amendments offered by Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON from the District that would strike approximately 70 general legislative provisions in the bill. These provisions contain regulations and restrictions related to the management and finances of the District Government, as well as a rider that would ban the use of funds for activities intended to secure voting representation in Congress for the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, the residents of the District deserve to be represented in the Congress of the United States, just like the residents of the Third District of Kansas deserve to be represented. District residents deserve the right to advocate the support or defeat of pending legislation before Congress, a right currently enjoyed by residents in all 50 states. The founding Fathers fought the Revolutionary War to protest taxation without representation, and all that the District's residents are requesting is full access to this inherent American right.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported and will continue to support both the theory and practice of "home rule" for the District of Columbia. The District's nearly 600,000 residents deserve the same right to self-government that the rest of America enjoys. I urge my colleagues to stand up today for the principle of local government and the belief that all Americans have the inherent right to govern themselves without unnecessary Federal intervention.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the bill.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE
OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Pursuant to House Resolution 563, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Amendment No. 3 in House Report 106-790 offered by Mr. BILBRAY of California, followed by Amendment No. 2 in House Report 106-790 offered by Mr. SOUDER of Indiana.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BILBRAY

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on Amendment No. 3 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by a voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 265, noes 155, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 472]

AYES—265

Aderholt	Capps	English
Archer	Castle	Etheridge
Armey	Chabot	Everett
Baca	Chambliss	Ewing
Bachus	Chenoweth-Hage	Fletcher
Baker	Clay	Foley
Baldacci	Clement	Forbes
Barcia	Coble	Fossella
Barr	Coburn	Fowler
Barrett (NE)	Collins	Franks (NJ)
Bartlett	Combest	Frelinghuysen
Barton	Cook	Gallegly
Bass	Costello	Ganske
Bentsen	Cox	Gekas
Bereuter	Cramer	Gephardt
Biggert	Crane	Gibbons
Bilbray	Cubin	Gilchrest
Bilirakis	Cunningham	Gillmor
Bishop	Danner	Gilman
Bliley	Davis (VA)	Goode
Blunt	Deal	Goodlatte
Boehlert	DeGette	Goodling
Bono	DeLay	Gordon
Boswell	DeMint	Goss
Brady (TX)	Deutsch	Graham
Bryant	Diaz-Balart	Granger
Burr	Dickey	Green (TX)
Burton	Doolittle	Green (WI)
Buyer	Dreier	Greenwood
Callahan	Edwards	Gutknecht
Calvert	Ehlers	Hall (TX)
Camp	Ehrlich	Hansen
Canady	Emerson	Hastings (WA)
Cannon		Hayes

Hayworth	McKinney	Sensenbrenner
Hefley	McNulty	Sessions
Heger	Menendez	Shadegg
Hill (MT)	Metcalfe	Shaw
Hilleary	Mica	Shays
Hobson	Miller (FL)	Sherwood
Hoeckstra	Miller, Gary	Shimkus
Holden	Moore	Shuster
Holt	Moran (KS)	Simpson
Hooley	Myrick	Skeen
Horn	Nethercutt	Skelton
Hostettler	Ney	Smith (MI)
Houghton	Northup	Smith (NJ)
Hulshof	Norwood	Smith (TX)
Hunter	Nussle	Souder
Hyde	Ortiz	Spence
Inslee	Ose	Spratt
Isakson	Oxley	Stabenow
Istook	Packard	Stearns
Jackson-Lee	Pallone	Stenholm
(TX)	Pastor	Stump
John	Payne	Sununu
Johnson (CT)	Pease	Sweeney
Johnson, Sam	Peterson (MN)	Talent
Jones (NC)	Peterson (PA)	Tancredo
Kasich	Petri	Tauzin
Kelly	Phelps	Taylor (MS)
King (NY)	Pickering	Taylor (NC)
Kingston	Pitts	Terry
Klecza	Pombo	Thomas
Knollenberg	Porter	Thornberry
Kolbe	Portman	Thune
Kuykendall	Price (NC)	Tiahrt
LaHood	Pryce (OH)	Toomey
Largent	Quinn	Traficant
Latham	Radanovich	Turner
LaTourette	Ramstad	Udall (CO)
Leach	Regula	Udall (NM)
Lewis (CA)	Reyes	Upton
Lewis (KY)	Reynolds	Visclosky
Linder	Riley	Vitter
Lipinski	Rodriguez	Walden
LoBiondo	Roemer	Walsh
Lofgren	Rogan	Watkins
Lucas (KY)	Rogers	Watts (OK)
Lucas (OK)	Ros-Lehtinen	Weldon (FL)
Luther	Rothman	Weldon (PA)
Manzullo	Roukema	Weller
Martinez	Royce	Whitfield
Mascara	Ryan (WI)	Wicker
McCrery	Ryun (KS)	Wilson
McHugh	Salmon	Wolf
McInnis	Saxton	Wu
McIntyre	Scarborough	Young (FL)
McKeon	Schaffer	

NOES—155

Abercrombie	Doyle	Maloney (NY)
Ackerman	Duncan	Markey
Allen	Engel	Matsui
Andrews	Evans	McCarthy (MO)
Baird	Farr	McCarthy (NY)
Baldwin	Fattah	McDermott
Ballenger	Filner	McGovern
Barrett (WI)	Ford	Meehan
Berkley	Frank (MA)	Meek (FL)
Berman	Frost	Meeks (NY)
Berry	Gejdenson	Millender-
Blagojevich	Gonzalez	McDonald
Blumenauer	Hall (OH)	Miller, George
Boehner	Hastings (FL)	Minge
Bonilla	Hill (IN)	Mink
Bonior	Hilliard	Moakley
Borski	Hinchee	Mollohan
Boucher	Hinojosa	Moran (VA)
Boyd	Hoeffel	Morella
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Murtha
Brown (FL)	Hutchinson	Nadler
Brown (OH)	Jackson (IL)	Napolitano
Capuano	Jefferson	Oberstar
Cardin	Jenkins	Obey
Carson	Johnson, E. B.	Olver
Clyburn	Jones (OH)	Owens
Condit	Kanjorski	Pascrell
Conyers	Kaptur	Paul
Cooksey	Kennedy	Pelosi
Coyne	Kildee	Pickett
Crowley	Kilpatrick	Pomeroy
Cummings	Kind (WI)	Rahall
Davis (FL)	Kucinich	Rangel
Davis (IL)	LaFalce	Rivers
DeFazio	Lampson	Rohrabacher
Delahunt	Lantos	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Larson	Rush
Dunn	Lee	Sabo
Dingell	Levin	Sanchez
Dixon	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Doggett	Lowey	Sandlin
Dooley	Maloney (CT)	Sanford

Sawyer	Stark	Velazquez
Schakowsky	Strickland	Wamp
Scott	Stupak	Watt (NC)
Serrano	Tanner	Waxman
Sherman	Tauscher	Weiner
Shows	Thompson (CA)	Wexler
Sisisky	Thompson (MS)	Weygand
Slaughter	Thurman	Woolsey
Smith (WA)	Tierney	Wynn
Snyder	Towns	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—13

Becerra	Klink	Vento
Campbell	Lazio	Waters
Clayton	McCollum	Wise
Eshoo	McIntosh	
Gutierrez	Neal	

□ 1226

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Messrs. WAMP, HUTCHINSON, and EVANS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. DEGETTE, and Messrs. EVANS, DEUTSCH, PRICE of North Carolina, ROTHMAN, and PAYNE changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 472 I inadvertently pressed the "nay" button. I meant to vote "aye."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 563, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the remaining amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. SOUDER:

In section 150, strike "Federal".

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 181, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 473]

AYES—239

Aderholt	Biggert	Callahan
Archer	Bilbray	Calvert
Armey	Bilirakis	Camp
Baca	Blagojevich	Canady
Bachus	Bliley	Cannon
Baker	Blunt	Chabot
Ballenger	Boehner	Chambliss
Barcia	Bono	Clement
Barr	Boswell	Coble
Barrett (NE)	Brady (TX)	Coburn
Bartlett	Bryant	Collins
Barton	Burr	Combest
Bass	Burton	Cook
Bereuter	Buyer	Costello

Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
John

Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Mica
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pascarell
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan

Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traffant
Turner
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Minge
Mink

Becerra
Campbell
Chenoweth-Hage
Eshoo
Gutierrez

Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sawyer

NOT VOTING—14

Klink
Lazio
McCollum
McIntosh
Neal
Taylor (NC)
Vento
Waters
Wise

□ 1235

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4942) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 563, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 207, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 474]

YEAS—217

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Biggett
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode

NAYS—207

Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner

Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Martinez
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pease
Peterson (PA)

Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traffant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—181

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Frelinghuysen
Clayton
Clyburn

Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foley
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Ganske

Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Greenwood
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinche
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleckza

Forbes	Maloney (NY)	Roemer
Ford	Markey	Rothman
Frank (MA)	Mascara	Roybal-Allard
Frost	Matsui	Rush
Gejdenson	McCarthy (MO)	Sabo
Gephardt	McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez
Gonzalez	McDermott	Sanders
Gordon	McGovern	Sandlin
Green (TX)	McKinney	Sawyer
Hall (OH)	McNulty	Schakowsky
Hall (TX)	Meehan	Scott
Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Hill (IN)	Meeks (NY)	Serrano
Hilliard	Menendez	Sherman
Hinchey	Millender	Shows
Hinojosa	McDonald	Sisisky
Hoeffel	Miller, George	Skelton
Holden	Minge	Slaughter
Holt	Mink	Smith (WA)
Hooley	Moakley	Snyder
Hoyer	Mollohan	Spratt
Inslee	Moore	Stabenow
Jackson (IL)	Moran (VA)	Stark
Jackson-Lee	Morella	Stenholm
(TX)	Murtha	Strickland
Jefferson	Nadler	Stupak
John	Napolitano	Tanner
Johnson, E.B.	Neal	Tauscher
Jones (OH)	Oberstar	Taylor (MS)
Kanjorski	Obey	Thompson (CA)
Kaptur	Olver	Thompson (MS)
Kennedy	Ortiz	Thurman
Kildee	Owens	Tierney
Kilpatrick	Pallone	Towns
Kind (WI)	Pascrell	Turner
Klecza	Pastor	Udall (CO)
Kucinich	Paul	Udall (NM)
LaFalce	Payne	Velazquez
Lampson	Pelosi	Visclosky
Lantos	Peterson (MN)	Waters
Larson	Phelps	Watt (NC)
Lee	Pickett	Waxman
Levin	Pomeroy	Weiner
Lewis (GA)	Price (NC)	Wexler
Lipinski	Rahall	Weygand
Lofgren	Rangel	Woolsey
Lowey	Reyes	Wu
Luther	Rivers	Wynn
Maloney (CT)	Rodriguez	

NOT VOTING—10

Becerra	Klink	Vento
Campbell	Lazio	Wise
Eshoo	McCollum	
Gutierrez	McIntosh	

□ 1252

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) (during the vote). The chair notes a disturbance in the gallery in contravention of the law and rules of the House.

The Sergeant-at-Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

□ 1253

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1654, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 574 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 574

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill

(H.R. 1654) to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. REYNOLDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 574 is a standard rule providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, known as NASA.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. Additionally, the rule provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, this House could not have picked a more appropriate time for consideration of this conference report.

Earlier this week, the crew of mission STS-106 entered the International Space Station to prepare for the arrival of its first permanent crew.

Those crew members became the first humans to enter the service module which will serve as a living quarters and command and control center for the space station complex, an historic, multinational effort that is expected to create more than 75,000 jobs here at home.

With their scheduled return to Earth on Wednesday, I know that this House and this Nation wishes Commander Terry Wilcutt and the crew of *Atlantis* Godspeed.

Since the dawn of man, the human race has been ingrained with a fascination and a need to slip beyond its boundaries and explore the unknown. From across the continents to the depths of the oceans and to the far reaches of space, that pioneer spirit continues to this day. And its contributions and discoveries have had a significant impact on our society and our way of life.

When Neil Armstrong took that giant leap for mankind on July 20, 1969, perhaps he did not realize that the same technology that protected him from the harsh elements and atmosphere of the Moon would one day allow a 6-year-old boy from Virginia Beach to walk in the sunlight of the Earth.

Just a couple years ago, Mikie Walker became the first American child to receive a modified space suit that protects him from the sun's ultraviolet rays and other light sources.

Suffering from a genetic disorder that causes extreme and potentially

dangerous sunlight sensitivity, NASA spacesuit technology allowed him to play outdoors for the first time in his young life.

More than 1,300 documented NASA technologies have benefited U.S. industry, improved our quality of life, and created jobs for Americans.

The Space Shuttle program alone has generated more than 100 technology spin-offs, including a tiny 2-inch by 1-inch, 4-ounce artificial heart pump whose technology was first used to drive fuel through the Space Shuttle.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying legislation will allow NASA to continue to ensure this Nation's leadership role in space exploration and applied science.

The underlying legislation authorizes funding for the Space Shuttle, International Space Station, scientific research, Payload/ELV support and investments in support at the level of the administration's request.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. space program's new technologies, breakthroughs in medical research and other scientific discoveries have quite literally changed the lives of people across the globe.

Recognizing NASA's development of noninvasive diagnostic capabilities in the life sciences, the underlying legislation includes the House language setting aside \$2 million for early detection systems for breast and ovarian cancer.

□ 1300

The legislation reflects Congress' continued endorsement of NASA's faster, better, cheaper concept and belief that a greater number of small missions will do more to advance certain scientific goals than large missions launched just once every decade.

Additionally, NASA has made strides to reduce institutional costs including management restructuring, facility consolidation and procurement reform. Under this legislation, they will be encouraged to continue to pursue these actions. With Congress' commitment to move our space program forward, young Americans will continue to be attracted to fields and job markets like science and engineering, areas that are key to making American industry more competitive across the globe.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) for their hard work on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, which provides for the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1654, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Act of 2000. It is especially fitting that we should consider this conference report today since our shuttle astronauts have been this week working in space

to outfit and activate the International Space Station in preparation for the first full-time crew's arrival in early November. NASA has scheduled a long list of flights to the space station to install modules which will aid in the long-term mission of research that has been designed specifically for this weightlessness scientific laboratory.

To fulfill these important missions of the space agency, this conference agreement authorizes a total of \$14.2 billion for NASA in fiscal year 2001 and \$14.6 billion in fiscal year 2002.

Mr. Speaker, this is the usual rule providing for the consideration of conference reports, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report and in support of the rule. I want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), chairman and also the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics. I also commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), for navigating this important authorization through all the necessary hurdles and coming to the floor today with a good bill.

I am pleased that an amendment assisting our farmers and our ranchers I offered during the original consideration of this legislation remains in this final package. The amendment directs the Administrator of NASA to discover and catalog the kind of remote sensing information, commercial and otherwise, that might help farmers and ranchers determine potential crop shortages and surpluses and ultimately make decisions about how they might best use their land.

Our ability to anticipate crop production around the world by using remote sensing technologies has advanced tremendously over the last 30 years. We are now able to estimate yields of some of the major crops, within plus or minus 10 percent 60 days before harvest. That means often within 30 days after planting, in southern climates we can predict expected over- and under-production before planting starts in some northern areas. By keeping track of what is happening on the ground, with planting date, moisture, etc. we can predict what is happening to that crop. Other farmers can adjust their plantings. We can help stop shortages and excess and maximize profit. We can make sure that there is not hunger because of the lack of knowledge on the part of farmers to plant the kind of acreage necessary to accommodate shortages in other parts of the world.

Once again, I am pleased that this provision has been retained. I am

pleased to stand in support of this rule and this legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the conference report, the NASA Reauthorization Act. I believe it is a good bill and will continue to support NASA in its science exploration endeavors while maintaining the balance and cost effectiveness within its priorities. I want to specifically thank the chairman of the committee and the ranking member for their continued support of an amendment that I have had included in the legislation.

There have been two major occurrences within the past 10 years that have proven to be a striking blow to national security interests of our Nation. First, the People's Republic of China, the PRC, used information it obtained as a result of our cooperation on satellite technology to upgrade its ballistic missile system and thereby improving its range and accuracy of its booster systems. It also used information obtained as a result of deliberate and successful espionage efforts at our nuclear laboratories at the Department of Energy in order to improve their nuclear warhead arsenal.

While I recognize the value of international cooperation on our space program, it is vital that such cooperation not result in the transfer of inappropriate technology or otherwise increase the threat to U.S. national security and international peace. I believe my amendment accomplishes this by requiring the Inspector General of NASA to assess, on an annual basis, in consultation with the intelligence community, NASA's compliance with export control laws and the exchange of technology and information that could be used to enhance the military capacities of foreign entities.

This amendment reestablishes that it is the policy of the United States to make certain our good faith efforts to share our technological advances with world partners are not turned against us in the form of advanced military threat.

Mr. Speaker, NASA is one of the most respected governmental institutions in the world and its contributions to the technological development in the United States are enormous. This amendment ensures that the reputation so painstakingly earned is never tarnished again. I want to praise the bill's sponsors, especially the chairman of the committee, for standing with us on this amendment and urge passage of this rule and this important legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would urge adoption of the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 574, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1654) to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 2000, 2001 and 2002, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Pursuant to House Resolution 574, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 12, 2000, at page H7404.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1654.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SENSENBRENNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1654 and urge my colleagues to vote for the conference report so that we can send this bipartisan bill to the President and have it signed into law.

This bill is endorsed by all the conferees, regardless of party, in both the House and the Senate. I wish to express my appreciation for the hard work of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) and offer my thanks for their services on the conference committee and their suggestions for compromise without which we would not be on the House floor today.

In passing this bill, Congress will help determine the priority investments in science and technology needed to fulfill America's future in space.

H.R. 1654, the NASA Authorization Act of 2000, authorizes the activity of our civilian space program for fiscal years 2001 and 2002. The bill authorizes \$14,184,400,000 for NASA in fiscal year

2001, which is about \$149 million more than the President requested. It also authorizes \$14,465,400,000 for NASA in fiscal year 2002, which is \$160 million above the President's request.

The bill fully funds the request for human space flight, including the Space Shuttle and the International Space Station. More importantly, it contains key policy provisions to control cost growth and maintain the schedule of the International Space Station.

The bill caps station costs at \$25 billion. We have slightly increased the program reserves that a blue ribbon task force argued were needed to avoid future costs growth. Additionally, we have added a contingency authorization of 20 percent to address the worst case scenarios, such as a partner's withdrawal from the program or the loss of an element during launch. We have also protected the space station design, which will remove a source of future cost growth and scheduled delays.

By moving NASA in the direction of a commercial Transhab structure, we transfer the risks and costs of development to any private sector entrepreneur willing to take them. We have also developed three new provisions to address the Russian situation. For years, the Russian Government has failed to provide the resources needed for the Russian Space Agency to meet its obligations to the International Space Station partnership. These failures have cost the United States some \$5 billion and delayed the program's completion by over 4 years.

The Russian Government recently diverted two progress vehicles and a Soyuz spacecraft to Mir, despite previous promises to use them to meet Russia's obligation to the International Space Station. This bill would seek to prevent recurrences by directing the highest levels of the U.S. Government to raise this issue with their counterparts in Russia. Hopefully, by bringing higher level political attention to the problem, we can solve it.

The bill also directs the NASA administrator to seek and renegotiate the appropriate international agreements to bring the benefits each partner receives from its involvement in the International Space Station into line with the partner's actual contributions. This provision will help us return the International Space Station partnership to the equitable foundation required by the Intergovernmental Agreement. Simply put, the administrator would have to seek to reduce Russia's utilization rights while increasing our own and those of our other partners until such time as Russia meets all of its obligations to the International Space Station.

Last but not least, the bill directs the administrator to seek to reduce America's share of the operating costs as compensation for any additional capabilities we provide to our partners through NASA's Russian Program As-

surance activities. NASA plans to spend about \$1.2 billion directly making up for Russia's failures. Some of this funding will result in a more capable station so it makes sense to reduce our outyear costs vis-a-vis the other partners as compensation for performing above and beyond the call of duty.

In addition to the policy provisions intended to improve our human space flight program, we have increased funding for the critical area of science aerodynamics and technology. These critical investments are needed to build a better future and have produced such past scientific and technological breakthroughs as the Topex-Poseidon spacecraft, which has vastly improved our knowledge of the El Nino effect and its impact on the global environment.

NASA's activities in space science have brought us the amazing discoveries of distant planets and black holes by the Hubble Space Telescope and the Chandra X-ray Observatory. Aeronautics research has improved the performance and efficiency of our military and civilian aircraft, while life and microgravity research is helping chart the growth of cancer cells.

□ 1315

These additional funds will accelerate NASA's Near Earth Object Survey to detect asteroids and comets that may threaten Earth, to enable NASA to conduct an Earth Science Data Purchase program that leverages billions in private investments for scientific purposes, to allow NASA to fund additional life and microgravity researchers so that the International Space Station is fully utilized for scientific benefit, and to accelerate NASA's efforts to leverage its scientific efforts to improve math and science education in the United States.

Members may be pleased to hear that we have authorized funding for space grant colleges and universities, which many Members from both sides of the aisle have sought.

There have been no NASA authorization bills sent to the President since 1992. This is the first time in 8 years that the House and the Senate have managed to build a consensus about the policies and priorities that affect the future of our space program. By passing this bill, we hope to give the appropriators additional tools and guidance to use in their annual deliberations. We will provide congressional guidance on a variety of space issues facing NASA and again demonstrate our commitment to the future of science and technology in the United States. I urge my colleagues to adopt this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words, add a few words to what our chairman, the gentleman from Wis-

consin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), has said in support of the conference report. The report, of course, provides a 3-year authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Specifically, it provides a total authorization of \$42.4 billion over the period starting in fiscal year 2000 through fiscal year 2002, including the authorization of \$14.184 billion for fiscal year 2001 and \$14.62 billion for fiscal year 2002.

While I feel like I may be as conservative maybe as some of the other guys around here in the House, I still believe and I think we are on solid ground when we invest in NASA. I think it is the right thing to do, and I think especially it is the right thing to do now that we finally balanced the Federal budget, and that we are in for some years of surplus years.

Within those overall spending levels, the conference report fully funds NASA's major programs in both fiscal year 2001 and fiscal year 2002, including the International Space Station and the Space Shuttle. As part of the Space Shuttle authorization, funding is provided for needed safety and reliability upgrades to the Shuttle. All of the other accounts are also funded at or above the levels requested by the administration, including the Space Launch Initiative, an initiative that is intended to dramatically reduce the cost of getting payloads into orbit.

An area of research that I am personally interested in is life science and microgravity research. I am very pleased that the conference report increased funding for this important research, research that has already benefited our citizens here on Earth in many ways, and I am convinced that we will see even more significant ventures and more safe returns on our investment in that research once the space station is operational.

Among the areas receiving increases are NASA's educational programs. In particular, funding for the Space Grant program have been increased to \$28 million in both fiscal year 2001 and fiscal year 2002. That is an increase of almost \$9 million over what the President had requested for fiscal year 2001.

In addition to other very good features of this bill, in addition to the authorization levels, the conference report for H.R. 1654 includes a number of policy provisions. One of the policy provisions, namely section 313 on "Innovative Technologies for Human Space Flight," was proposed by our former chairman and my good friend the late George Brown. Ever the visionary, George wished to push NASA to apply the lessons of faster, better, and cheaper to human space flight, so that human exploration behind Earth's orbit could become affordable for this Nation in the not-too-distant future.

I will not take up a lot more time detailing all the provisions included in H.R. 1654; the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the chairman, has done a very good job of that.

My colleagues have copies of the conference report and accompanying statement of managers available to them. Instead, I would like to close by expressing my appreciation to fellow conferees for all their hard work, including the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER), who is not only a good guy, he is very knowledgeable. He is good to work with, and we appreciate him; the gentleman from California (Chairman ROHRABACHER), who worked steadily with us; the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON); the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON); Chairman MCCAIN; Chairman FRIST; Chairman STEVENS; Senator HOLLINGS; and Senator BREAU.

In particular, I again want to commend the chairman for his leadership; as chairman of the conference, it was a difficult conference at times, but I think all the conferees made a good-faith effort to achieve a constructive piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if H.R. 1654 is enacted into law, it will become the first NASA Authorization Act enacted since 1992. I think this is quite an accomplishment. I believe that it is important for both NASA and for the Congress that we do enact H.R. 1654. Furthermore, I believe that the conference report for H.R. 1654 represents a reasonable compromise that will help ensure the continued strength of the Nation's civil space program. I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, first as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Aeronautics, I would like to personally thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), my ranking minority member on the committee, for the great spirit of bipartisan spirit that we have shown in working together.

As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) just stated, this would be the first authorization bill that we will pass, the first NASA authorization bill that we passed since 1992, and let us all hope that we do this and get this through the system. But it has only been possible because of the goodwill and the spirit of compromise and honest disagreement, but also honest spirit of compromise that we have had working with the Members of the other party.

Let me thank especially the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL). He is sort of a treasure in this institution, a bipartisan treasure, let me add, in that he has an institutional memory that has served us well on this subcommittee and in our full committee, Committee on Science, and his good sense has helped guide us along here.

And also, of course, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER),

who is the chairman of this subcommittee. He has provided me personal guidance in this job as chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics and helped us be successful in our mission.

The bill before us now, H.R. 1654, the NASA authorization bill, offers the taxpayer a true choice in advancing America's leadership role in space. I rise in support of this bill, not because it is my role as chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics and as a member of the team that helped draft the legislation, but because it offers the right approach in supporting the Nation's space exploration requirements at a time when we find ourselves on the verge of a technological and scientific epiphany.

H.R. 1654 reflects a bipartisan effort, as I said, to craft legislation enabling NASA to continue its work for the good of the Nation. Moreover, House and Senate conferees on both sides of the aisle labored for many months to ensure that this bill strikes the right balance between setting budget priorities and meeting NASA mission needs, as well as meeting the needs of our country to remain a leader in space exploration and utilization.

H.R. 1654 addresses the full array of elements that support NASA's responsibility for space exploration and near-Earth space transportation missions. In the Human Space Flight section of H.R. 1654, funding for international Space Station, the Space Shuttle, Payload/Expendable Launch Vehicle Support and Investments and support for these things, and support matches the President's request for fiscal year 2001 and fiscal year 2002.

Within the science and aeronautics section and the technology section, the bill either matches or exceeds the President's request for fiscal year 2001 and 2002. And even in the face of major failures involving both Mars missions, we saw fit to authorize increases for space science by the tune of \$19 million for fiscal year 2001 and \$24 million for fiscal year 2002, and that was above the President's requested level.

That is, again, working together, we realized that if we are going to be a successful player in space, we have got to expect that that success will come with some failures, and we should build upon our failures in order to have a success.

Failures do not precipitate in this committee, bipartisan or should I say partisan, bickering that would in some way set back America's space program. Instead, we see failures as a means to learn and to move forward. It is important to note that space solar power benefits from those increases that I have been talking about today, and this space solar power and ability to relay system for energy and space solar power development is a technology that I believe will help address the energy needs of our country in the future.

Similarly, increases have been authorized for life and microgravity

science are 13 percent higher than the President's request for the same year. Further, Earth science, aerospace technology, and academic programs for fiscal year 2001 and 2002 have seen substantial increases over the President's request. And finally, I am pleased to note that H.R. 1654 includes provisions to ensure that cooperative agreements between NASA and the People's Republic of China do not result in China improving its space launch assets and its ballistic missile capabilities.

H.R. 1654 contains a title regarding the International Space Station, including sections dealing with Russia's difficulty in meeting its obligations in the completion of the International Space Station. This issue was addressed by the chairman, and let me say the chairman has provided leadership in making sure that we do have cooperation with Russia, but to be done so in a way that is cost effective for our country.

We also have provisions to ensure that the space station is used for the scientific purposes that it was intended for and not just an engineering project, although, as an engineering project, it is certainly a fantastic and laudable achievement.

NASA's Space Launch Initiative offers the American people the opportunity to change how government has conducted the launch vehicle technology development, and through H.R. 1654, Congress essentially codifies the long-standing view that government launch needs can be supported by a market-competitive space industry.

So we have, and it is not enough, however, to proclaim a national space policy. NASA must stay the course by funding technology and other risk-reduction activities that gives the broadest possible applications of new space technologies.

And so I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this regulation legislation, the first NASA authorization bill that we have been able to get through this body in about 10 years.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics of the Committee on Science.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 1654, the NASA Authorization Act of 2000. I was a conferee on H.R. 1654, and I know the work that went into coming up with an agreement. While it is not a perfect piece of legislation, I believe that it is a constructive agreement that contains a number of useful policy provisions.

It also establishes funding targets for the next 2 years, which can provide important direction and stability for the Nation's civil space program.

The Statement of Managers that accompanies the conference report lays out the major funding authorizations. It also describes some of the policy provisions included in H.R. 1654. As a result, I will not spend a great deal of

time discussing the details of H.R. 1654; instead, I would just like to make the following points:

First, this bipartisan conference report endorses, and in some cases, augments, the administration's funding priorities for NASA. I am pleased that we can get a bipartisan agreement that the administration's vision for NASA should be supported.

Second, the conference report adds funding in several important areas.

One of these areas is in education. I know firsthand in my district how important it is that we do all we can to support science and math education, especially at some of our smaller colleges and universities. Therefore, we have included increased funding for NASA's teacher faculty preparation enhancement programs in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, many Members recognize the value of the national space grant college and fellowship program, and the bill increases funding for that worthy program.

We also have provided funding above the President's request for minority university research education, and we have increased the funding for the experimental program to stimulate cooperative research.

Another area where the conference has added funding is in the area of aeronautics. We have seen the stresses that the air traffic transportation system is facing these days, and we all are concerned about the impacts on our quality of life.

□ 1330

That is why this conference report significantly increases the amount of funding for research on aircraft noise reduction, and for the development of cleaner, more energy efficient aircraft engines. The bill also makes a significant investment of \$70 million in NASA's Aviation Safety Research Program for both fiscal years 2001 and 2002.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take any more time to review the conference report, as I know there are others who would like to speak. Instead, I would just like to close by expressing my appreciation to my fellow conferees in both the House and Senate for their efforts to make this a productive conference. I am pleased that we were able to reach an agreement, and hope the House will support this conference report.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), a member of the conference.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time, and I rise in strong support of this legislation.

I, too, would like to commend the chairman and the ranking member of the full committee and as well the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), for the bipartisan

willingness to work together to try to get a bill through. I would also like to acknowledge the staff that worked very hard on this, Eric Sterner on the majority side and Dick Obermann.

I believe we have before us a good piece of legislation that the President should be pleased to sign into law.

It has been said several times that this is the first NASA bill in 8 years. It may also be the first NASA bill to come to the floor of the House while astronauts are orbiting above us as we speak. The Shuttle Atlantis was launched a week ago Friday, and they are completing the initial preparations for making the Space Station ready for a permanent crew, or a crew that will stay on orbit for 4 months that will be launched in November. They are currently working on a lot of electrical work, on getting the station ready and putting a lot of supplies up there.

I think it is a tremendous milestone that we have reached to be able to see the Space Station finally coming together, it has been very hotly debated on the floor of this body, and as well for us to be moving ahead with important legislative priorities for how we are going to manage the Space Station.

One of the features in this bill that I am quite pleased with, and I would just like to echo the comments made by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) about some of the educational priorities in the bill, I think they are very good. I am particularly pleased about the feature in this bill establishing a new approach to how we handle commercial space. I believe if space is ever going to be utilized the way I think many of us would like to see it utilized, we have to really see a flourishing of commercial operations in space.

What we are trying to do in this legislation is take a new approach as to how we do commercial space. I think it has a tremendous potential to be successful. The proof of the pudding is, of course, always in the eating, so time will tell, but I was very pleased to be able to work with the minority in crafting this bill, and I think it is a good future direction for NASA.

NASA is about the future, and I think we have a lot of reasons to be very pleased with this bill. I encourage all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) whose district encircles Johnson Space Center.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend not only the ranking member and the chairman for the significant work that has been done to bring this report to us, but all of our colleagues on the conference committee for bringing the first conference report for our NASA authorization bill in 8 years. I know the amount of time and hard work that each put into this bill, as well as the tremendous work of the committee staff, especially on our side, Dick Obermann, and I appreciate every bit of it.

I look forward to lending my support to this conference report, but I want to

express my continued concerns about Section 127. Section 127 in its current form retains subsection (a), Replacement Structure, which is a general prohibition against NASA's use of funds authorized for the definition, design, procurement or development of an inflatable space structure to replace any International Space Station components scheduled for launch under the June 1999 Assembly Sequence. Subsection (b) has been revised to reflect an exception to permit NASA to lease or otherwise use a commercially provided inflatable habitation module under certain specified conditions.

As currently included in the June 29 House draft, Section 128 would effectively prevent NASA from jointly developing an inflatable habitation module with a commercial partner, even if NASA's contribution to such joint development were to be constrained to NASA's planned investment and related costs.

NASA is currently evaluating a very serious commercial proposal. Negotiations to date have been based on the principle that NASA would agree to develop an inflatable space structure in conjunction with the commercial participant only if NASA does not assume costs or risk greater than those associated with the baseline non-inflatable habitation module.

I will be introducing legislation today that will modify Section 127(b) to include an exception for joint development, and a clarification that the cost restriction would apply to NASA's planned remaining cost for the baseline habitation module.

That being said, I again want to commend my colleagues on bringing this conference report to the floor. It funds all of NASA's accounts, Space Station, Space Shuttle, Space Launch Initiative, science programs and academic programs, at or above the President's request. We appreciate that. I encourage a yes vote.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to engage the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) in a colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, as we grapple with increasing oil and natural gas prices, we must realize that the administration's flawed 1997 Kyoto Protocol, if implemented, would effectively double our energy costs and sacrifice millions of American jobs. As the gentleman is aware, many people are deeply concerned over administration efforts to implement the protocol prior to Senate ratification as mandated by the Constitution.

Section 315 of the NASA reauthorization legislation would provide \$5 million for research on the carbon cycle and carbon sequestration. Sound scientific research on the mapping and monitoring of vegetation and its role

in the carbon cycle is to be commended. However, modeling and research should not cross the line and delve into carbon trading.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I share the concerns of the gentleman from Michigan, and as the chairman of the Committee on Science, I want to assure the gentleman that there was no intent to and indeed this bill does not authorize modeling or research into carbon trading.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his attention to this matter.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), a member of the committee.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this conference report and to discuss one of the important initiatives which it contains. As has been said, this is the first NASA reauthorization to pass Congress since 1992, and I want to congratulate the chairman and ranking Democratic members on the Committee on Science and the subcommittees, on which I have the pleasure of serving, for the accomplishment of having gotten this bill here.

This is not a perfect bill, but I think, on balance, it represents significant progress. This bill increases funding for many important priorities, including space science, Earth science, aerospace technology, science grants, Historically Black Colleges and Universities and other vital initiatives.

As the former superintendent of North Carolina's schools, I am particularly pleased by the improvements in the educational provisions of this bill, and I am proud to discuss an important education initiative that I recommended and the committee accepted that is a part of this bill.

This bill directs NASA to develop an education initiative for our Nation's schools in recognition of the 100th anniversary of the first powered flight which will take place on December 17, 2003. On this date in 1903, Orville and Wilbur Wright took their dreams of powered flight from the drawing boards of their bicycle shop to the Crystal Coast of North Carolina. On that day, our world was changed forever. The anniversary of this historic accomplishment provides an excellent opportunity for our Nation's schools to promote the importance of math and science and education.

Mr. Speaker, America's future will depend on our ability to adapt to change in technology that will dominate life in the 21st century. Our Nation's record economic growth is being fueled by gains in the technology sector, but recent studies show that Amer-

ica's students are falling behind their counterparts around the world in areas of math and science education. It is no longer a luxury to demand excellence in science and mathematics; it is an absolute necessity.

The 100th Anniversary of Flight Education Initiative will use the history of flight and the benefits of flight on science and mathematics and scientific principles that are underlying the flight to generate interest among students in math and science education. This initiative provides an excellent opportunity to recapture our young people's interests in the wonders of flight and space exploration and rekindle their interests in math and science.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the committee's leaders for including this important provision in the bill, and encourage my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report for H.R. 1654, the NASA Authorization Act of 2000. I want to certainly commend the chairman of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER); and the committee ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL); as well as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER); and the subcommittee ranking member, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), for their dedication and their efforts in bringing this bill to the floor.

In my home State of Maryland, we are proud to have the Goddard Space Flight Center, the centerpiece of NASA's Earth science enterprise. The space science research that is performed at Goddard is vital, not just for NASA, but for our country. From the Hubble Space Telescope to the Earth Observing System's Mission to Planet Earth to the Tracking and Data Relay Satellite System, which is NASA's primary satellite communications system, Goddard's capabilities and functions are entirely unique to all of NASA's 10 space centers.

The work at Goddard allows us to answer the unexplained questions of our universe and help predict the future of our planet. So I am pleased that the funding levels in this conference report allow Goddard to continue fulfilling its vital scientific research mission.

H.R. 1654 provides a healthy 2-year authorization of appropriations for NASA at \$14.184 billion for fiscal year 2001, and \$14.625 billion for fiscal year 2002. These funding levels represent an increase over the amount requested by the President of almost \$150 million in fiscal year 2001 and \$160 million in fiscal year 2002. Specifically, for NASA's space science programs, the conference report increases the President's budget

request by \$19 million in fiscal year 2001 and \$24 million the subsequent year. For Earth science programs, the conference report increases the President's budget request by \$25 million in fiscal year 2001 and \$25 million in the subsequent year 2002.

So, by authorizing these NASA funding levels, the research at Goddard will advance our understanding of our global environment system. It will also determine how the Earth has evolved, and observe how we interact with other planets.

Mr. Speaker, I support the funding levels and the provisions in this conference report, and I urge my colleagues to support this conference report as well.

□ 1345

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), a supporter of NASA and the space station.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate the chairman of the committee and the ranking member, along with the subcommittee Chair and ranking member. I believe this is a day of great celebration and commemoration. For we hope, as this bill is supported by our colleagues, as I ask for their support, that this may be the first NASA space authorization bill that gets to the President since 1992.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation in particular because of the work that has been done by the conference committee, particularly noting that the conference report includes a \$6.3 billion amount for the International Space Station, and \$9.45 billion for the Space Shuttle.

Now, there needs to be some substance behind these numbers. Many of my colleagues from Texas, and I appreciate very much the steadfastness of the ranking member on behalf of the various space centers throughout our country, which include, of course, Marshall and Kennedy and, of course, Johnson Space Center, that deal particularly with our Space Shuttle and, as well, our International Space Station.

Mr. Speaker, I am gratified for the investment, because my concern has always been that we need to build leaders for space and science in the future; and out of this funding for the NASA space effort comes the recognition that we must support, historically supporting Asian, Hispanic and African American colleges. There is \$54 million to provide for the research and education of young people at these institutions. I am very gratified that institutions like Texas Southern University, Oakwood College in Huntsville, Texas Southern University being in Houston, Texas, will be able to access these dollars to provide opportunities for young students to come in and actually confront the issues of space.

I am gratified, likewise, that we have the dollars to begin to assess the needs of training our young people in the primary and secondary schools in math and science.

Mr. Speaker, just an hour or so ago I was listening to a technology conference that spoke about the need of improving the scores of our young people in primary and secondary education in math and science. The only way we can do it is if we focus on it; and I am very delighted that NASA funding in an educational component mentioned by my colleague will include the opportunity for us to make it interesting to study math and science.

I do want to note the Johnson Space Center and many of the sort of complementary efforts that it has made with our school districts, and I look forward to that work being done even more.

I do want to note as well that the conference report does not include a prohibition on the use of funds for the Triana satellite program, and I believe that was a prudent decision by the conferees. We must keep our resource choices open in the area of space exploration, especially in light of the recent discoveries on the surfaces of Mars and the Moon. There was a vigorous debate about that, and I am delighted that we have been able to secure the funding for the Triana program. I think it is vital and necessary.

I am, however, concerned that the agreement still retains a House provision prohibiting the use of funds for the development of Trans-Hab, an inflatable space structure to replace any baseline module on the space station. I think that there is some light at the end of the tunnel, because there is the opportunity to produce this privately; but I hope to join the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) in hoping that we can also engage with public funds to do this important work.

Finally, I would say that many people question what we do with monies when we give it to the space station and the Space Shuttle. I am reminded of the great strides we have made in diabetes research, heart research, HIV/AIDS research, cancer research; but the most important aspect of what we do is to keep America in front of the technological curve and to work with our partners to develop opportunities in enhancing environment, better fuel resources, and training our young people for the work of the 21st century. I congratulate our committee, and I hope the President will sign this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the passage of H.R. 1654, the Conference Report on NASA Reauthorization. When the House passed the bill by a vote of 259–168 on May 19, 1999 and the Senate amended the bill and passed it by unanimous consent on Nov. 5, 1999 it became obvious that this is a bipartisan measure in the truest sense.

Because of the strategic location of the constituents of the 18th Congressional District of Houston, Texas, both physically and passionately to America's space effort, I approach this

hearing with much concern. The Johnson Space Center in Houston, Texas has been designated the lead center for management of the Space Station program.

The health of America's space program is of vital concern to all of the Members of the House Science Committee. This concern is strongly felt by those of us on the Subcommittee on Space Aeronautics because we are charged with the heavy responsibility of recommendation and oversight of the United States involvement in space exploration.

The last time a NASA reauthorization bill reached the president was in 1992. Since then, funding and policy decisions for NASA have been made in the VA–HUD appropriations bill.

This agreement authorizes \$42.4 billion for FY 2000 through FY 2002 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)—including \$13.6 billion in FY 2000, \$14.2 billion in FY 2001 and \$14.6 billion in FY 2002. The FY 2001 authorization is approximately \$149 million more than the administration's request, \$430 million more than the House-passed bill and \$220 million more than the Senate version. The agreement provides approximately \$160 million more than the president requested in FY 2002, \$780 million more than in the House-passed bill and \$410 million more than the Senate-passed measure.

FY 2000 authorizations, reflecting the FY 2000 appropriations, include \$5.5 billion for Human Space Flight, \$5.6 billion for Science, Aeronautics and Technology, \$2.5 billion for Mission Support and \$20 million for the NASA Inspector General.

The authorization total of \$2.1 billion is provided for the international space station in FY 2001 and \$1.9 billion in FY 2002. The agreement includes a cost cap of \$25.0 billion for development of the international space station. Space shuttle launch costs connected with assembly of the space station are capped by the agreement at \$17.7 billion.

Unlike the House-passed bill, the agreement does not include a prohibition on the use of funds for the Triana satellite program, which I believe to be a prudent decision by the conferees. We must keep our research choices open in the area of space exploration especially in light of the recent discoveries on the surface of Mars and the Moon.

The agreement retains the House provision prohibiting the use of funds for the development of Trans-Hab, an inflatable space structure, to replace any baseline module on the space station. The agreement, however, does permit NASA to lease a privately developed Trans-Hab.

I believe that the reauthorization of NASA is long overdue, but that it is better that the 106th Congress took its time to act than to have not acted at all in this vital area of our nation's interest.

I thank the conferees for their dedication in completing the work on this legislation and would urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of its passage.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), the vice chairman of the Committee on Science.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

We have heard a great deal of discussion about the specifics of this bill. I

simply wish to add some general comments about it.

First of all, I want to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Science for successfully, for the first time in almost a decade, getting a conference report on NASA authorization with the Senate's cooperation. I believe this is a good omen for the future, and I certainly congratulate the chairman for his hard work and his success.

Over the past half century, America has led the world in science. Also during that half century, space science has captured the imagination of the American public to a greater extent than any other scientific work that we have performed. Taking a trip to the Moon was a momentous event, not only for our Nation, but for our entire planet; and we continue to bask in that accomplishment today.

However, now we are down to the hard work of not only exploring space, but learning more about our universe through experimentation in space. This is grinding hard work, perhaps not as glorious as going to the Moon, but extremely important; and I am very pleased that this bill will increase our ability to perform space science as the United States, with the cooperation of other nations, during the next half century. It will be a long time before we engage in interplanetary travel, so we will not have that spectacular show for some time; but we will get a lot accomplished in space thanks to this bill, and it will provide a great deal of knowledge that will be very useful to our Nation and to the people of our planet in the future as we continue to expand the boundaries of our knowledge and find uses for the results that we find.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

(Mr. LARSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report and add to the chorus of extending my personal gratitude for the outstanding leadership performed by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the chairman of the Committee on Science, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the ranking member, and the other distinguished members of the conference committee and the Committee on Science in general for their hard work.

I also would like to commend directly the men and women of NASA and their visionary leader, Administrator Dan Goldin. His vision of aerospace as a commercial industry, and as continued space exploration, the confluence in coming together of biotechnology, information technology, and the nanosciences is what places this country on the cutting edge of technology.

I have had the opportunity to bring our astronauts to our schools. These heroes of space exploration indeed are an inspiration to all of our children.

Now, this is just a small portion of what NASA does for the continuing education of our children, especially in the critical areas of math and science.

I would also like to thank very much the conference committee for including the ultra-efficient engine technology. As Administrator Goldin has pointed out, when it comes to engine technology, there is no greater core science that goes into the creation of machine than that science, math and engineering capability that goes into the making of aircraft.

Again, I commend the chairman and the entire committee.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time, just to say that this is a good bill, it is an excellent compromise, it is something that has been done for the first time in 8 years. I urge the membership to support it.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1654, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act is a fiscally responsible space bill that not only authorizes appropriations for NASA, but also imposes rules and restrictions on the space agency to ensure appropriate spending of federal funds.

As a member of the House Committee on Science, and as a member of the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee, I am very concerned that NASA receives adequate funding. Citizens of the United States benefit economically from the many technologies learned through space exploration. Much of today's technology came from the space program, and much of tomorrow's technology will come from research taking place today. These new technologies will not only make our lives better but also will increase health and medical advances, labor and time saving devices, transportation and improve communication devices. Clearly, the new technologies generated from our space program greatly impact our economic growth and our ability to remain competitive in the world marketplace.

Additionally, the bill will set a spending cap on Space Station development thereby forcing our foreign partners to live up to their commitments.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital for the U.S. to remain on the cutting edge of scientific discoveries and technological advances, and H.R. 1654 provides the funding to ensure that NASA spearheads both of these efforts. I urge my colleagues to support this Act and safeguard the future of generations to come.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1654, the NASA Reauthorization bill. This is an exciting week to bring this legislation to the floor as the crew of the Space Shuttle Atlantis prepares the International Space Station for full-time service. In addition to the Space Station, this bill provides funding for NASA's other priorities including the Space Shuttle Program and for the Earth and Space Science program.

I opposed this legislation when the House first took it up because of efforts to kill the Triana Satellite Mission. Triana, a project directed by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in La Jolla, California in conjunction with the Goddard Space Flight Center in my District, would provide not only a real-time view of

the Earth for distribution on the Internet, but will also include instruments to study solar influences on climate, ultraviolet radiation, space weather, and the microphysical properties of clouds. I thank my colleagues in the Senate for taking the partisanship out of this important program.

This conference report also authorizes significant funding for the Science, Aeronautics, and Technology Account. The \$2.3 billion for Space Science will insure that the Hubble Space Telescope Program continues to provide us with phenomenal data over the next ten years. It is crucial that Hubble's successor, the Next Generation Space Telescope, receive the necessary support to match and surpass Hubble's success. In addition, the \$1.5 billion for NASA's Earth Science programs will insure that programs like the Landsat, a cornerstone of NASA's Earth Science Enterprise, can continue to study the Earth's global environment, and that the Terra Satellite, which has been vital in the past week in fighting wild fires in the west, receives the funding necessary for continuing operations.

I urge my colleagues to support this conference report and support NASA as we continue to explore our last frontier.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 17, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 475]

YEAS—399

Abercrombie	Boehner	Collins	Doolittle	Klecza	Rangel
Aderholt	Bonilla	Combest	Doyle	Knollenberg	Regula
Allen	Bonior	Condit	Dreier	Kolbe	Reyes
Andrews	Bono	Cook	Duncan	Kucinich	Reynolds
Archer	Borski	Cooksey	Dunn	Kuykendall	Riley
Baca	Boswell	Costello	Edwards	LaFalce	Rivers
Bachus	Boucher	Cox	Ehlers	LaHood	Rodriguez
Baird	Boyd	Coyne	Ehrlich	Lampson	Rogan
Baker	Brady (PA)	Cramer	Emerson	Lantos	Rogers
Baldacci	Brady (TX)	Crane	Engel	Largent	Rohrabacher
Baldwin	Brown (FL)	Crowley	English	Larson	Ros-Lehtinen
Ballenger	Brown (OH)	Cubin	Etheridge	Latham	Rothman
Barcia	Bryant	Cummings	Evans	LaTourette	Roukema
Barr	Burr	Cunningham	Everett	Leach	Roybal-Allard
Barrett (NE)	Burton	Danner	Ewing	Levin	Royce
Bartlett	Buyer	Davis (FL)	Farr	Lewis (CA)	Rush
Barton	Callahan	Davis (IL)	Fattah	Lewis (GA)	Ryan (WI)
Bass	Calvert	Davis (VA)	Filner	Lewis (KY)	Ryun (KS)
Bentsen	Camp	Deal	Fletcher	Lipinski	Sabo
Bereuter	Canady	DeGette	Foley	LoBiondo	Salmon
Berkley	Cannon	Delahunt	Forbes	Lofgren	Sanchez
Berman	Capps	DeLauro	Fossella	Lowe	Scott
Berry	Capuano	DeLay	Fowler	Lucas (KY)	Sawyer
Biggert	Cardin	DeMint	Franks (NJ)	Lucas (OK)	Saxton
Bilbray	Carson	Deutsch	Frelinghuysen	Luther	Scarborough
Bilirakis	Castle	Diaz-Balart	Frost	Maloney (CT)	Schakowsky
Bishop	Chabot	Dickey	Gallegly	Maloney (NY)	Scott
Blagojevich	Chambliss	Dicks	Ganske	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner
Bliley	Clayton	Dingell	Gejdenson	Markey	Serrano
Blumenauer	Clement	Dixon	Gekas	Mascara	Sessions
Blunt	Clyburn	Doggett	Gephardt	Matsui	Shadegg
Boehlert	Coburn	Dooley	Gibbons	McCarthy (MO)	Shaw
			Gilchrest	McCarthy (NY)	Shays
			Gillmor	McCrery	Sherman
			Gilman	McDermott	Sherwood
			Gonzalez	McGovern	Shimkus
			Goode	McHugh	Shows
			Goodlatte	McIntyre	Shuster
			Goodling	McKeon	Simpson
			Gordon	McKinney	Sisisky
			Goss	McNulty	Skeen
			Graham	Meehan	Skelton
			Granger	Meek (FL)	Slaughter
			Green (TX)	Meeks (NY)	Smith (MI)
			Green (WI)	Menendez	Smith (NJ)
			Gutknecht	Metcalfe	Smith (TX)
			Hall (OH)	Mica	Smith (WA)
			Hall (TX)	Millender-McDonald	Snyder
			Hansen	Miller (FL)	Souder
			Hastings (FL)	Miller, Gary	Spence
			Hastings (WA)	Minge	Spratt
			Hayes	Mink	Stabenow
			Hayworth	Moakley	Stearns
			Hefley	Mollohan	Stenholm
			Herger	Moore	Strickland
			Hill (IN)	Moran (KS)	Stump
			Hill (MT)	Moran (VA)	Stupak
			Hilleary	Morella	Sununu
			Hilliard	Murtha	Sweeney
			Hinchey	Myrick	Talent
			Hinojosa	Nadler	Tanner
			Hobson	Napolitano	Tauscher
			Hoefel	Neal	Tauzin
			Hoekstra	Nethercutt	Taylor (MS)
			Holden	Ney	Taylor (NC)
			Holt	Norhup	Terry
			Hooley	Norwood	Thomas
			Horn	Nussle	Thompson (CA)
			Hostettler	Oberstar	Thompson (MS)
			Houghton	Obey	Thornberry
			Hoyer	Olver	Thune
			Hulshof	Ortiz	Thurman
			Hunter	Ose	Tiahrt
			Hutchinson	Owens	Tierney
			Hyde	Oxley	Toomey
			Inslee	Packard	Towns
			Isakson	Pallone	Trafficant
			Istook	Pascarell	Turner
			Jackson (IL)	Pastor	Udall (CO)
			Jackson-Lee	Payne	Udall (NM)
			(TX)	Pease	Upton
			Jefferson	Pelosi	Velazquez
			Jenkins	Peterson (MN)	Visclosky
			John	Peterson (PA)	Vitter
			Johnson (CT)	Petri	Walden
			Johnson, E. B.	Phelps	Walsh
			Johnson, Sam	Pickering	Wamp
			Jones (NC)	Pickett	Waters
			Jones (OH)	Pitts	Watkins
			Kanjorski	Pombo	Watt (NC)
			Kaptur	Pomeroy	Watts (OK)
			Kasich	Porter	Waxman
			Kelly	Portman	Weiner
			Kennedy	Price (NC)	Weldon (FL)
			Kildee	Pryce (OH)	Weldon (PA)
			Kilpatrick	Quinn	Weller
			Kind (WI)	Radanovich	Wexler
			King (NY)	Rahall	Weygand
			Kingston		Whitfield

Wicker	Woolsey	Young (AK)
Wilson	Wu	Young (FL)
Wolf	Wynn	

NAYS—17

Barrett (WI)	Lee	Sanders
Chenoweth-Hage	McInnis	Sanford
Coble	Miller, George	Schaffer
Conyers	Paul	Stark
DeFazio	Ramstad	Tancred
Frank (MA)	Roemer	

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman	Ford	Martinez
Armey	Greenwood	McCollum
Becerra	Gutierrez	McIntosh
Campbell	Klink	Vento
Clay	Lazio	Wise
Eshoo	Linder	

□ 1424

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida changed his vote from "nay" to "yea".

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING RON LASCH ON HIS RETIREMENT

(Mr. THOMAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked to speak out of order for 1 minute because there is a situation here on the floor that may not recur again. There are many new Members here who are beginning to learn that this institution could not run without the staffs that sometimes are never acknowledged or recognized but go about their work very quietly and efficiently.

Unfortunately, someone who had been of great assistance to our side of the aisle for more than 42 years decided to leave just as quietly and efficiently as he had carried out his job over the years. I am not able to deal with the efficiency of his leaving, but I do think we can deal with the quietness.

Somewhere back there is the gentleman by the name of Ron Lasch. I would ask Ron Lasch to come to the floor. Mr. Speaker, as usual, Ron Lasch is not to be found. But for 42 years, he provided this House with good counsel and assistance in doing our jobs.

There are a number of people who make our jobs possible who do not get the desired or needed or worthy recognition. I just thought it would be nice, since he may not be able to be here again or he will not be here again after this particular occasion, to say to one of our long-time employees, thank you very much, Ron Lasch.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that Ron is not on the floor, but I want to rise on behalf of all of us on this side of the aisle. The gentleman from California indicated that Ron Lasch has been helpful to his side. That is of course very true. He is, after all, assigned that responsibility.

On the other hand, I want my colleagues to know and I want everybody to know that those of us on this side of the aisle who happened to be on the gentleman's side of the aisle and needed a question answered felt very comfortable talking to Ron Lasch. Because Ron Lasch, although he served in a partisan role, clearly felt himself an institutional person who wanted to facilitate the workings of this institution on behalf of the American people.

I want to join the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the Committee on House Administration in saying that we share his congratulations and appreciation for all the work that Ron Lasch has done and the service that he has performed for everybody on the floor of the House and for the American public.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I happen to know Mr. Lasch is, in fact, seeing this telecast, and he ought to come to the floor if he can. But I think that what is most important about Ron Lasch is that, as he sat in the back, he was always kind of a governor on sometimes the crazy emotions that this House gets itself whipped up into.

What Ron Lasch is always able to do is to really, he has been around so long, is to be so grounded and to immediately translate a sense of responsibility and a sense of self-control and a sense of humility to every Member. If Ron looked one in the eye and called one on something, one listened to him. Because he had seen so much, and he had such a great sense of this place.

Many times, Members of Congress get, as we all do in life, get full of ourselves. Ron Lasch is one guy that always said, Wait a minute. Remember, you came in here. It is a privilege to serve, and you are going to leave this place. And trust me, when you go out the door, you are only what you are when you came in the door, just another human being trying to do a job.

□ 1430

And he is a great, great guy, I think one of the best that we have ever had in this House; and the House will very much miss him. But I have a suspicion that he will move in and out.

To the younger Members, they should avail themselves of Ron Lasch in these last couple weeks that he will be around this floor.

Speaking for many of the Members who have been here for a long time, I think it would be fair for me to say, Ron Lasch, thank you, God bless you, and Godspeed.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing Ron's name before us once again. He left us so suddenly, none of us really had an opportunity to wish him well or to say a proper goodbye.

Ron served both sides of the aisle in an appropriate manner. He was not only a time keeper, a controller of emotions in the back of the room, but he was a good advisor.

I had the opportunity of having Ron join us on several of our CODELs where he added a great deal and was able to exchange thinking with parliamentarians overseas.

So I thank the gentleman for raising this. We wish Ron good health and happiness in his retirement.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I say I can say without fear of contradiction that I probably have known Ron Lasch longer than any other person in this Chamber because Ron Lasch and I came to Congress together as pages just a few months apart when we were at the age of 16 years.

Earlier this summer we did some tributes to Ron Lasch but, of course, he chose, as he has today, to not be here on the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we almost got him.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, we almost got him today. The gentleman is absolutely right.

So I would simply repeat what I said in that tribute, and that is that this body is poorer for his absence; and we have been richer as an institution for what he brought to this body, the sense of calm, the sense of history, the sense of understanding of where this place is and where it is going.

I think that he has elevated and has leavened this body I think substantially. I believe that the House of Representatives will miss him tremendously. I know all of us individually will. I wish him well.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, just let me say that, as we move into this period in which demands are going to be made that are actually inhumane and we expect materials to be prepared in absolute time frames, for those staff who are here and continue to carry on the work, I just think that they also need to get recognition, credit, and a "thank you" ahead of time. All too often we fail to say, it is not just us. Because, without them, it would not be us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend Ron Lasch. He is a real loss to our Chamber. We all know him as an institutional citizen dedicated to the House of Representatives and dedicated to legislative government.

On a trip to Australia and New Zealand where we met with cabinet ministers and members of their parliament who had made their governments more effective and efficient, Ron was a great asset to us given his knowledge about comparisons he had seen in other parts of the world.

He knew the great history of the House of Representatives. He was dedicated. He is a very humble person, who helped many of us when as newcomers we sought this advice. And anyone that did not ask his advice should have because they would then have learned what kind of fine institution is the House of Representatives. He provided good advice to those who wanted to become effective legislators.

It is good to see Ron back. I hope that he will take these various encomiums with the respect and affection of his elected friends as he retires from the House that was his home for so long.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Chair of the Committee on Appropriations and the ranking member for allowing us to disrupt the proceedings.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks regarding consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 4516 and that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4516, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 565, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4516) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of legislative day of July 26, 2000 at page H7095.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to bring this conference report to the House. It was ready for consideration by the House before we recessed for our respective political conventions. But because of the schedule, we are just now getting to it today. The conference

report includes three bills that have already been passed by the House.

As my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, the House has passed all 13 of our appropriations bills. We also passed the major supplemental that was requested by the President this year. We have already considered the conference report on that supplemental and on the Defense appropriations bill and the Military Construction appropriations bill. And so, we are on the move here.

I am happy to report that this conference report includes the Legislative Branch appropriations bill and also the Treasury Postal bill, which funds in part the executive offices of the Executive Branch of Government, including the White House.

It also includes a bill that was passed in the House by a vote of 420-2 on repeal of the Spanish-American War tax on telephone services.

And so, we have those three bills that passed the House with substantial votes included in this conference report. Even the Treasury Postal bill passed the House by a vote that could be considered a landslide relative to previous votes. We passed that bill by a vote of 216-202. That is a lot better vote than we usually get on that bill. Nevertheless, we have worked hard with our counterparts in the other body, and we bring this conference report today.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following table for the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Bill, 2001:

H.R. 4985 - TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
Departmental Offices	134,034	161,006	149,437	149,610	156,315	+22,281
Contingent emergency supplemental.....	24,900			502		-24,900
Department-wide systems and capital investments programs	43,448	89,279	41,787	37,279	47,287	+3,839
Office of Inspector General.....	30,599	33,608	31,940	32,899	32,899	+2,300
Inspector General for Tax Administration.....	111,781	118,427	115,477	118,427	118,427	+6,646
Treasury Building and Annex Repair and Restoration	22,700	31,000	31,000	22,700	31,000	+8,300
Expanded Access to Financial Services.....		30,000	2,000	400	2,000	+2,000
Money Laundering Strategy.....		15,000				
Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.....	27,818	34,694	34,694	37,576	37,576	+9,758
Counterterrorism Fund (emergency funding)		55,000		55,000	55,000	+55,000
Violent Crime Reduction Programs.....	130,081					-130,081
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center:						
Salaries and Expenses	84,027	93,483	93,483	93,198	94,483	+10,456
Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, & Related Expenses.....	21,175	17,331	17,331	29,205	29,205	+8,030
Total	105,202	110,814	110,814	122,403	123,688	+18,486
Interagency Law Enforcement: Interagency crime and drug enforcement	60,502	103,476	103,476	90,976	103,476	+42,974
Financial Management Service.....	200,555	202,851	198,736	202,851	206,851	+6,296
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms: Salaries and Expenses	564,773	760,051	731,325	724,937	768,695	+203,922
United States Customs Service:						
Salaries and Expenses	1,698,227	1,887,866	1,822,365	1,804,687	1,863,765	+165,538
Harbor Maintenance Fee Collection	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	
Operation, Maintenance and Procurement, Air and Marine Interdiction Programs	108,688	156,875	125,778	128,228	133,228	+24,540
Automation modernization:						
Automated Commercial System.....		123,000	123,000	123,000	123,000	+123,000
International Trade Data System.....		5,400	5,400	5,400	5,400	+5,400
Automated Commercial Environment.....		210,000	105,000		130,000	+130,000
Subtotal.....		338,400	233,400	128,400	258,400	+258,400
Customs Services at Small Airports (to be derived from fees collected)	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	
Offsetting receipts.....	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	
Total	1,809,915	2,386,141	2,184,543	2,064,315	2,258,393	+448,478
Bureau of the Public Debt.....	177,143	182,901	182,901	182,901	182,901	+5,758
Payment of government losses in shipment.....	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	
Internal Revenue Service:						
Processing, Assistance, and Management	3,280,250	3,699,499	3,487,232	3,506,939	3,567,001	+286,751
Tax Law Enforcement	3,336,838	3,443,859	3,332,676	3,378,040	3,382,402	+45,564
Earned Income Tax Credit Compliance Initiative.....	144,000	145,000	145,000	145,000	145,000	+1,000
Information Systems.....	1,455,401	1,583,565	1,488,090	1,505,090	1,545,090	+89,689
Information technology investments		71,751				
Advance appropriation, FY 2002.....		422,249				
Total, FY 2001.....	8,216,489	8,943,674	8,452,998	8,535,069	8,639,493	+423,004
Advance appropriation, FY 2002.....		422,249				
United States Secret Service:						
Salaries and Expenses	667,312	824,500	823,800	778,279	823,800	+156,488
Title II general provisions (P.L. 106-113)	10,000					-10,000
(By transfer)	(21,000)					(-21,000)
Contingent emergency supplemental.....	10,000					-10,000
Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, & Related Expenses.....	4,185	5,021	5,021	4,283	8,941	+4,756
Total	691,497	829,521	828,821	782,562	832,741	+141,244
Total, title I, Department of the Treasury	12,352,437	14,520,692	13,200,949	13,161,407	13,597,742	+1,245,305
Current year, FY 2001.....	12,352,437	14,098,443	13,200,949	13,161,407	13,597,742	+1,245,305
Appropriations	(12,317,537)	(14,043,443)	(13,200,949)	(13,105,905)	(13,542,742)	(+1,225,205)
Emergency funding.....	(34,900)	(55,000)		(55,502)	(55,000)	(+20,100)
Advance appropriations, FY 2002		422,249				
TITLE II - POSTAL SERVICE						
Payment to the Postal Service Fund	28,620	29,000	29,000		29,000	+380
Advance appropriation, FY 2002.....	64,438	67,093	67,093	67,093	67,093	+2,657
Total	93,058	96,093	96,093	67,093	96,093	+3,037

H.R. 4985 - TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE III - EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
Compensation of the President and the White House Office:						
Compensation of the President.....	250	390	390	390	390	+ 140
Salaries and Expenses	52,243	53,288	52,135	53,288	53,288	+ 1,045
Executive Residence at the White House:						
Operating Expenses	9,225	10,900	10,286	10,900	10,900	+ 1,675
White House Repair and Restoration.....	808	5,510	658	5,510	968	+ 160
Special Assistance to the President and the Official Residence of the Vice President:						
Salaries and Expenses	3,609	3,673	3,664	3,673	3,673	+ 64
Operating expenses	330	354	354	354	354	+ 24
Council of Economic Advisers.....	3,825	4,110	3,997	4,110	4,110	+ 285
Office of Policy Development	4,017	4,032	4,030	4,032	4,032	+ 15
National Security Council.....	6,970	7,165	7,148	7,165	7,165	+ 195
Office of Administration	39,050	43,737	41,185	43,737	43,737	+ 4,687
Contingent emergency supplemental.....	8,400					-8,400
Office of Management and Budget.....	63,256	68,786	67,143	67,935	68,786	+ 5,530
Office of National Drug Control Policy:						
Salaries and expenses	22,823	25,400	24,759	24,312	24,759	+ 1,936
Title II general provisions (P.L. 106-113)	3,000					-3,000
Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center.....	29,052	20,400	29,750	29,052	29,053	+ 1
Total	54,875	45,800	54,509	53,364	53,812	-1,063
Federal Drug Control Programs:						
High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program	191,271	192,000	217,000	196,000	206,500	+ 15,229
Special forfeiture fund	215,297	259,000	219,000	144,300	233,600	+ 18,303
Unanticipated Needs	996	1,000				-996
Elections Commission of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.....		2,500				
Total, title III, Executive Office of the President and Funds Appropriated to the President	654,422	702,245	681,499	594,758	691,315	+ 36,893
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled....	2,664	4,158	4,158	4,158	4,158	+ 1,494
Federal Election Commission	38,008	40,500	40,240	39,755	40,500	+ 2,492
Federal Labor Relations Authority.....	23,737	25,058	25,058	25,058	25,058	+ 1,321
General Services Administration:						
Federal Buildings Fund:						
Appropriations	-20,022	681,871			464,154	+ 484,176
Advance appropriation, FY 2002-2004		477,484		374,345	276,400	+ 276,400
Limitations on availability of revenue:						
Construction and acquisition of facilities	(74,979)	(779,788)		(3,000)	(472,176)	(+ 397,197)
Rescission of funds in P.L. 104-208	(-20,782)					(+ 20,782)
General provisions (sec. 410)				(2,500)	(2,500)	(+ 2,500)
Repairs and alterations.....	(598,674)	(721,193)	(490,592)	(671,193)	(671,193)	(+ 72,519)
Installment acquisition payments.....	(205,668)	(185,369)	(185,369)	(185,369)	(185,369)	(-20,299)
Rental of space.....	(2,782,186)	(2,944,905)	(2,944,905)	(2,944,905)	(2,944,905)	(+ 162,719)
Building Operations.....	(1,580,909)	(1,624,771)	(1,580,909)	(1,524,771)	(1,624,771)	(+ 43,862)
Subtotal.....	(5,242,416)	(6,256,026)	(5,201,775)	(5,431,738)	(5,900,914)	(+ 658,488)
Repayment of Debt.....	(100,000)	(70,595)	(70,595)	(70,595)	(70,595)	(-29,405)
Total, Federal Buildings Fund, FY 2001.....	-20,022	681,871			464,154	+ 484,176
(Limitations)	(5,342,416)	(6,326,621)	(5,272,370)	(5,502,333)	(5,971,509)	(+ 629,093)
(Rescission of limitations).....	(-20,782)					(+ 20,782)
Policy and Operations	116,223	136,980	115,434	123,420	123,920	+ 7,697
Contingent emergency supplemental.....	3,300					-3,300
Disposal of property		8,000				
Office of Inspector General.....	33,317	34,520	34,520	34,520	34,520	+ 1,203
Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents.....	2,241	2,517	2,517	2,517	2,517	+ 276
General provision (P.L. 106-113, Title II).....	2,000					-2,000
Expenses, Presidential transition		7,100		7,100	7,100	+ 7,100
Total, General Services Administration, FY 2001	137,059	870,988	152,471	167,557	632,211	+ 495,152
Advance appropriations, FY 2002-2004		477,484		374,345	276,400	+ 276,400
Merit Systems Protection Board:						
Salaries and Expenses	27,481	29,437	28,857	29,437	29,437	+ 1,956
Limitation on administrative expenses	2,430	2,430	2,430	2,430	2,430	
Federal payment to Morris K. Udall scholarship and excellence in national environmental policy foundation.....	1,992	3,000	2,000	1,000	2,000	+ 8
Environmental Dispute Resolution Fund	1,245	1,250	1,250	500	1,250	+ 5

H.R. 4985 - TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
National Archives and Records Administration:						
Operating expenses	179,674	209,393	195,119	209,393	209,393	+29,719
Reduction of debt	-5,598	-5,598	-5,598	-5,598	-5,598
Repairs and Restoration	22,296	99,560	5,650	4,950	95,150	+72,854
Advance appropriation, FY 2002	88,000
Records Center Revolving Fund	22,000	-22,000
National Historical Publications & Records Commission: Grants program	6,250	6,000	6,000	6,450	6,450	+200
Rescission	-2,000	+2,000
Total	222,622	309,355	201,171	215,195	305,395	+82,773
Advance appropriation, FY 2002	88,000
Office of Government Ethics	9,080	9,684	9,684	9,684	9,684	+604
Office of Personnel Management:						
Salaries and Expenses	90,240	100,558	93,471	94,095	94,095	+3,855
Limitation on administrative expenses	95,124	101,986	101,986	99,624	101,986	+6,862
Office of Inspector General	956	1,360	1,360	1,356	1,360	+404
Limitation on administrative expenses	9,608	9,745	9,745	9,708	9,745	+137
Government Payment for Annuity, Employees Health Benefits	5,105,395	5,427,166	5,427,166	5,427,166	5,427,166	+321,771
Government Payment for Annuity, Employee Life Insurance	36,200	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	-1,200
Payment to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund	9,120,558	8,940,051	8,940,051	8,940,051	8,940,051	-180,507
Total, Office of Personnel Management	14,458,081	14,615,866	14,608,779	14,607,000	14,609,403	+151,322
Office of Special Counsel	9,703	11,147	10,319	10,733	11,147	+1,444
United States Tax Court	35,045	37,439	37,305	35,474	37,305	+2,260
Total, title IV, Independent Agencies	14,969,147	16,437,796	15,123,722	15,610,326	15,986,378	+1,017,231
Current year, FY 2001	14,969,147	15,960,312	15,123,722	15,147,981	15,709,978	+740,831
Appropriations	(14,967,847)	(15,960,312)	(15,123,722)	(15,147,981)	(15,709,978)	(+742,131)
Rescissions	(-2,000)	(+2,000)
Advance appropriations, FY 2002-2004	477,484	462,345	276,400	+276,400
Grand total	28,069,062	31,756,826	29,102,263	29,433,584	30,371,528	+2,302,466
Current year, FY 2001	28,004,626	30,790,000	29,035,170	28,904,146	30,028,035	+2,023,409
Appropriations	(27,968,426)	(30,735,000)	(29,035,170)	(28,848,644)	(29,973,035)	(+2,004,609)
Emergency funding	(38,200)	(55,000)	(55,502)	(55,000)	(+16,800)
Rescissions	(-2,000)	(+2,000)
Advance appropriations, FY 2002-2004	64,436	966,826	67,093	529,438	343,493	+279,057
(Limitations)	(5,342,416)	(6,328,621)	(5,272,370)	(5,502,333)	(5,971,509)	(+629,093)
(Rescission of limitations)	(-20,782)	(+20,782)
Scorekeeping adjustments:						
Bureau of The Public Debt (Permanent)	142,000	145,000	145,000	145,000	145,000	+3,000
Federal Reserve Bank reimbursement fund	128,000	131,000	131,000	131,000	131,000	+3,000
Limitation on admin expenses adjustment to BA	-1,561	+1,561
US Mint revolving fund	11,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	+3,000
Sallie Mae	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Federal buildings fund	-119,368	63,000	-309,000	-79,000	-74,000	+45,366
Advance appropriations:						
Postal service, FY 2000/2001	71,195	64,436	64,436	64,436	64,436	-6,759
Postal service, FY 2001/2002	-64,436	-67,093	-67,093	-67,093	-67,093	-2,657
IRS, FY 2002	-422,249
GSA, FY 2002-2004	-477,484	-374,345	-276,400	-276,400
National Archives, FY 2002	-88,000
Conveyance of land to the Columbia Hospital for Women (sec. 410)	-8,000	+8,000
NOAA retirement provision (sec. 654), FY 1999	5,650	-5,650
Government-wide early buyout (sec. 651)	30,000	-30,000
GSA early buyout (sec. 411)	-1,000	+1,000
FY 1999 supplemental (sec. 654)	-5,650	+5,650
Across the board cut (0.38%)	-73,000	+73,000
OMB/CBO adjustment	72,153	-72,153
OMB/CBO adjustment (mandatory to discretionary)	(-408)	(+408)
Total, scorekeeping adjustments	187,985	-548,390	-20,657	-253,002	-62,057	-250,042
Total mandatory and discretionary	28,257,047	31,208,436	29,081,606	29,180,582	30,309,471	+2,052,424
Mandatory	14,532,995	14,679,607	14,679,607	14,679,607	14,679,607	+146,612
Discretionary	13,724,052	16,528,829	14,401,999	14,500,975	15,629,864	+1,905,812

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as of this point, we have 2 of the 13 appropriation bills which must pass by October 1 actually through the system. Both of those bills fund the same department. Other than that, we have a lot of bills that are still caught midstream at various points between the two Houses.

This bill is, unfortunately, part of an unfortunate process under which decisions have evidently been made to send yet more bills down to the President which will be veto bait rather than bills that will be likely to become law.

That does nothing to put us any closer to getting our work done by the end of the fiscal year. And I regret that.

The legislative appropriations bill started out as a bill which every single Member of the minority side was willing to sign and send on to the other body and the President. Unfortunately, it was been packaged with a number of other unrelated items, other appropriations bills, as well as tax provisions which have no business in the bill.

In essence, at this point, this dog has three tails and no legs. It is not going anywhere. And the sooner we dispose of it, the sooner we can get back to reality.

I do not expect, unfortunately, that we are going to see many Members on this side voting for this bill because it, unfortunately, is another exercise in futility at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), who chairs the Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, which is the primary vehicle for this conference report.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank again our staff and ranking members for the cooperation in the Legislative Branch bill.

The conference agreement appropriates \$2.53 billion for fiscal year 2001.

Compared to FY 2000, including supplementals, the conference report is an increase of \$40 million, about 1.6 percent.

In personnel, the conference report cuts 47 equivalent jobs. There are no layoffs or RIFs, and all COLAs are funded.

Since 1994, we have cut 4,222 jobs throughout the legislative branch. That is a reduction of 15.2 percent. No other branch of the Federal Government comes close to that amount of downsizing undergone by the legislative branch.

The conference report includes funds for the further development of the National Digital Library program with the Library of Congress. This project is laying the foundation for integration of the Internet and our educational system.

There is also a provision requiring penalty clauses to be placed in the Ar-

chitect's construction projects. Without the ability to hold contractors to schedules and funding limitations, we are totally vulnerable to mismanagement and lax supervision. This provision is aimed at improving the Architect's control over his construction responsibilities.

The conference report does not include merger of the Capitol, Library, and GPO police, nor does the report include the human resources legislation for GAO.

The GAO matter may surface again at a later date. A few matters need to be worked out, and I am confident we can accomplish that in the future. We have asked the Comptroller General to concentrate on that.

The agreement includes an emergency FY2000 supplemental appropriation of \$2.1 million for congressional and Library of Congress security and \$9 million for urgent repairs at the Cannon garage.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the bill provides \$2.53 billion. It is 7.3 percent below the request of the President's budget. And FTE levels have been reduced by 47.

The bill maintains a smaller legislative branch as established by the policies set in the 104th Congress, and it provides stability to those operations that must support our legislative needs.

I include for the RECORD the following table that tabulates the funding agreement:

H.R. 4516 - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 2001

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE I - CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS						
SENATE						
Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress						
Gratuities, deceased Members.....					141	+141
Expense Allowances						
Expense allowances:						
Vice President.....	10	10		10	10	
President Pro Tempore of the Senate.....	10	10		10	10	
Majority Leader of the Senate.....	10	10		10	10	
Minority Leader of the Senate.....	10	10		10	10	
Majority Whip of the Senate.....	5	5		5	5	
Minority Whip of the Senate.....	5	5		5	5	
Chairman of the Majority Conference Committee.....	3	3		3	3	
Chairman of the Minority Conference Committee.....	3	3		3	3	
Chairman of the Majority Policy Committee.....				3	3	+3
Chairman of the Minority Policy Committee.....				3	3	+3
Subtotal, expense allowances.....	56	56		62	62	+6
Representation allowances for the Majority and Minority Leaders.....	30	30		30	30	
Total, Expense allowances and representation.....	86	86		92	92	+6
Salaries, Officers and Employees						
Office of the Vice President.....	1,721	1,785		1,785	1,785	+64
Office of the President Pro Tempore.....	437	453		453	453	+16
Offices of the Majority and Minority Leaders.....	2,644	2,742		2,742	2,742	+98
Offices of the Majority and Minority Whips.....	1,634	1,770		1,722	1,722	+88
Committee on Appropriations.....	6,525	6,917		6,917	6,917	+392
Conference committees.....	2,264	2,350		2,304	2,304	+40
Offices of the Secretaries of the Conference of the Majority and the Conference of the Minority.....	590	732		590	590	
Policy Committees.....	2,302	2,508		2,342	2,342	+40
Office of the Chaplain.....	277	288		288	288	+11
Office of the Secretary.....	14,202	14,738		14,738	14,738	+536
Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.....	34,794	35,341		34,811	34,811	+17
Offices of the Secretaries for the Majority and Minority.....	1,246	1,292		1,292	1,292	+46
Agency contributions and related expenses.....	21,332	22,337		22,337	22,337	+1,005
Total, salaries, officers and employees.....	89,968	93,253		92,321	92,321	+2,353
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate						
Salaries and expenses.....	3,901	4,046		4,046	4,046	+145
Office of Senate Legal Counsel						
Salaries and expenses.....	1,035	1,069		1,069	1,069	+34
Expense Allowances of the Secretary of the Senate, Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, and Secretaries for the Majority and Minority of the Senate						
Expenses allowances.....	12	12		12	12	
Contingent Expenses of the Senate						
Inquiries and investigations.....	71,604	74,136		73,000	73,000	+1,396
Expenses of United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control	370	370		370	370	
Secretary of the Senate.....	1,511	2,077		2,077	2,077	+566
Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.....	66,261	101,228		71,261	71,511	+5,250
Miscellaneous items.....	8,655	8,655		8,655	8,655	
Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account.....	245,703	273,591		253,203	253,203	+7,500
Official Mail Costs						
Expenses.....	300	300		300	300	
Total, contingent expenses of the Senate.....	394,404	460,357		408,866	409,116	+14,712
Total, Senate.....	489,406	558,823		506,406	506,797	+17,391
Across the board cut (0.38%).....	-2,036					+2,036
Net total, Senate.....	487,370	558,823		506,406	506,797	+19,427

H.R. 4516 - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 2001 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES						
Salaries and Expenses						
House Leadership Offices						
Office of the Speaker	1,723	1,798	1,759	1,759	1,759	+36
Office of the Majority Floor Leader	1,888	1,761	1,726	1,726	1,726	+38
Office of the Minority Floor Leader	2,050	2,140	2,096	2,096	2,096	+46
Office of the Majority Whip	1,404	1,500	1,466	1,466	1,466	+62
Office of the Minority Whip	1,042	1,121	1,096	1,096	1,096	+54
Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities	406	417	410	410	410	+4
Republican Steering Committee	755	779	765	765	765	+10
Republican Conference	1,225	1,289	1,255	1,255	1,255	+30
Democratic Steering and Policy Committee	1,324	1,381	1,352	1,352	1,352	+28
Democratic Caucus	657	687	668	668	668	+11
Nine minority employees	1,218	1,251	1,229	1,229	1,229	+11
Training and Development Program:						
Majority	284	290	278	278	278	-6
Minority	284	290	278	278	278	-6
Subtotal, House Leadership Offices	14,060	14,704	14,378	14,378	14,378	+318
Members' Representational Allowances Including Members' Clerk Hire, Official Expenses of Members, and Official Mail						
Expenses	406,279	422,894	410,182	410,182	410,182	+3,903
Committee Employees						
Standing Committees, Special and Select (except Appropriations)	93,878	99,242	92,196	92,196	92,196	-1,682
Committee on Appropriations (including studies and investigations)	21,095	22,530	20,628	20,628	20,628	-467
Subtotal, Committee employees	114,973	121,772	112,824	112,824	112,824	-2,149
Salaries, Officers and Employees						
Office of the Clerk	14,881	15,862	14,590	14,590	14,590	-291
Office of the Sergeant at Arms	3,746	3,858	3,692	3,692	3,692	-54
Office of the Chief Administrative Officer	57,289	64,180	58,550	58,550	58,550	+1,261
Office of Inspector General	3,926	4,040	3,249	3,249	3,249	-677
Office of General Counsel	840	877	806	806	806	-34
Office of the Chaplain	136	139	140	140	140	+4
Office of the Parliamentarian	1,172	1,256	1,201	1,201	1,201	+29
Office of the Parliamentarian	(1,011)	(1,086)	(1,035)	(1,035)	(1,035)	(+24)
Compilation of precedents of the House of Representatives	(161)	(170)	(166)	(166)	(166)	(+5)
Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House	2,045	2,130	2,045	2,045	2,045	
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House	5,085	5,140	5,085	5,085	5,085	
Corrections Calendar Office	825	851	832	832	832	+7
Other authorized employees	205	213	213	213	213	+8
Technical Assistants, Office of the Attending Physician	(205)	(213)	(213)	(213)	(213)	(+8)
Subtotal, Salaries, Officers and Employees	90,150	98,546	90,403	90,403	90,403	+253
Allowances and Expenses						
Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims	2,741	3,381	2,235	2,235	2,235	-506
Official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House	410	410	410	410	410	
Government contributions	128,704	138,355	138,726	138,726	138,726	+10,022
Miscellaneous items	676	676	393	393	393	-283
Special education needs					215	+215
Subtotal, Allowances and expenses	132,531	142,822	141,764	141,764	141,979	+9,448
Total, salaries and expenses	757,993	800,738	769,551	769,551	769,766	+11,773
Total, House of Representatives	757,993	800,738	769,551	769,551	769,766	+11,773
JOINT ITEMS						
Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 2001		1,000		1,000	1,000	+1,000
Joint Economic Committee	3,200	3,315	3,072	3,315	3,315	+115
Joint Committee on Taxation	6,431	6,747	6,174	6,686	6,430	-1
Office of the Attending Physician						
Medical supplies, equipment, expenses, and allowances	1,891	1,835	1,835	1,835	1,835	-56
Capitol Police Board						
Capitol Police						
Salaries:						
Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives	37,582	51,952	45,683	51,350	47,053	+9,471
Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate	40,776	54,118	47,086	51,350	50,089	+9,313
Subtotal, salaries	78,358	106,070	92,769	102,700	97,142	+18,764

H.R. 4516 - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 2001 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
General expenses.....	6,549	9,960	6,549	6,884	6,772	+223
Subtotal, Capitol Police.....	84,907	116,030	99,318	109,584	103,914	+19,007
Security enhancements.....	2,102	2,750				-2,102
Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office.....	2,293	2,371	2,201	2,371	2,371	+78
Statements of Appropriations.....	30	30	29	30	30	
Total, Joint items	100,854	134,078	112,629	124,821	118,895	+18,041
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE						
Salaries and expenses	1,992	2,095	1,816	2,066	1,820	-172
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE						
Salaries and expenses	26,121	28,493	27,403	27,113	28,493	+2,372
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL						
Capitol Buildings and Grounds						
Capitol buildings, salaries and expenses	53,697	60,036	44,234	44,191	43,689	-10,008
Capitol grounds.....	5,406	6,120	5,217	5,512	5,362	-44
Senate office buildings.....	66,109	66,628		63,974	63,974	-2,135
House office buildings.....	50,350	53,269	32,750	32,750	32,750	-17,600
Capitol Power Plant	41,897	45,272	43,551	43,989	43,815	+1,918
Offsetting collections	-3,985	-4,400	-4,400	-4,400	-4,400	-415
Net subtotal, Capitol Power Plant.....	37,912	40,872	39,151	39,569	39,415	+1,503
Total, Architect of the Capitol	213,474	226,927	121,352	185,996	185,190	-28,284
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS						
Congressional Research Service						
Salaries and expenses	70,973	75,640	73,810	73,374	73,592	+2,619
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE						
Congressional printing and binding	73,297	80,800	69,626	73,297	71,462	-1,835
Total, title I, Congressional Operations	1,732,074	1,907,594	1,176,187	1,762,624	1,756,015	+23,941
TITLE II - OTHER AGENCIES						
BOTANIC GARDEN						
Salaries and expenses	3,438	4,916	3,216	3,653	3,328	-110
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS						
Salaries and expenses	265,803	292,174	269,864	267,330	282,838	+17,035
Authority to spend receipts.....	-6,850	-6,850	-6,850	-6,850	-6,850	
Net subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....	258,953	285,324	263,014	260,480	275,988	+17,035
Copyright Office, salaries and expenses.....	37,485	38,903	38,771	38,332	38,523	+1,038
Authority to spend receipts.....	-26,254	-26,783	-31,783	-26,783	-29,283	-3,029
Net subtotal, Copyright Office.....	11,231	12,120	6,988	11,549	9,240	-1,991
Books for the blind and physically handicapped, salaries and expenses	47,802	48,983	48,507	48,711	48,609	+807
Furniture and furnishings	5,394	6,020	5,394	4,892	4,892	-502
Total, Library of Congress (except CRS)	323,380	352,447	323,903	325,632	338,729	+15,349
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL						
Library Buildings and Grounds						
Structural and mechanical care	19,857	20,278	15,837	16,347	15,970	-3,887
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE						
Office of Superintendent of Documents						
Salaries and expenses	29,872	34,451	25,652	30,255	27,954	-1,918
Government Printing Office Revolving Fund						
GPO revolving fund.....		6,000				
Total, Government Printing Office	29,872	40,451	25,652	30,255	27,954	-1,918

H.R. 4516 - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 2001 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE						
Salaries and expenses	378,961	402,918	371,896	387,867	387,867	+ 8,906
Offsetting collections	-1,400	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000	-1,600
Total, General Accounting Office	377,561	399,918	368,896	384,867	384,867	+ 7,306
Total, title II, Other agencies	754,108	818,010	737,504	760,754	770,848	+ 16,740
Grand total	2,486,182	2,725,604	1,913,691	2,523,378	2,526,863	+ 40,681
TITLE I - CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS						
Senate	487,370	558,823		506,406	506,797	+ 19,427
House of Representatives	757,993	800,738	769,551	769,551	769,766	+ 11,773
Joint Items	100,854	134,078	112,629	124,821	118,895	+ 18,041
Office of Compliance	1,992	2,095	1,816	2,066	1,820	-172
Congressional Budget Office	26,121	28,493	27,403	27,113	28,493	+ 2,372
Architect of the Capitol	213,474	226,927	121,352	185,996	185,190	-28,284
Library of Congress: Congressional Research Service	70,973	75,640	73,810	73,374	73,592	+ 2,619
Congressional printing and binding, Government Printing Office	73,297	80,800	69,626	73,297	71,462	-1,835
Total, title I, Congressional operations	1,732,074	1,907,594	1,176,187	1,762,624	1,756,015	+ 23,941
TITLE II - OTHER AGENCIES						
Botanic Garden	3,438	4,916	3,216	3,653	3,328	-110
Library of Congress (except CRS)	323,380	352,447	323,903	325,632	338,729	+ 15,349
Architect of the Capitol (Library buildings & grounds)	19,857	20,278	15,837	16,347	15,970	-3,887
Government Printing Office (except congressional printing and binding)	29,872	40,451	25,652	30,255	27,954	-1,918
General Accounting Office	377,561	399,918	368,896	384,867	384,867	+ 7,306
Total, title II, Other agencies	754,108	818,010	737,504	760,754	770,848	+ 16,740
Grand total	2,486,182	2,725,604	1,913,691	2,523,378	2,526,863	+ 40,681

NOTE: FY 2000 enacted includes 0.38% rescissions and legislative supplemental actions pending in H.R. 4516. Excluded from totals is a \$40,000,000 contingent emergency FY 2000 supplemental for FHA.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for being so kind in yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), the chairman, for the manner in which he conducted business with the ranking member on the minority side of the subcommittee. He was very inclusive, and we were able to work out the differences as we proceeded with this bill and at conference had a very good bill.

I also want to thank Ed Lombard, who was assisted by Kit Winter and Tom Martin, for the professionalism that was displayed in developing this bill.

On the minority side, I would like to thank Mark Murray, who worked with my assistant, Eve Young. They provided countless hours of guidance and assistance to the minority.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill started, it had a very bad allocation. There was a concern about the security, the safety of the House, of the Capitol. As we proceeded with this bill, it got better.

At conference, we had restored many of the cuts that were initially in the bill. We were able to maintain security by providing enough money to have the required two policemen at every door.

□ 1445

We were able to fund CRS to the level in which it would not have layoffs. We were able to give to the Members' accounts enough money so they could provide cost of living raises for their staff. We worked it out with the Senate, and the conference report was a very good one.

As we were leaving the conference report, we asked the chairman what was going to happen to the bill and he, in his wisdom, said we do not know how many flies are going to be on this dog. That is how we left the conference.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the conference is that today we are here and could have passed a legislative branch bill that would have served this House very well, but the leadership has decided to add the Treasury Postal bill and also the telephone excise tax bill. It will be with great reluctance that the minority side will probably not support this conference bill because of the manner in which the Treasury Postal bill was developed. So I will ask my colleagues on our side of the aisle that even though we have a very good legislative branch bill, the concerns of the Treasury Postal bill that has been tacked on to this bill gives enough concern in which we may not want to support it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman

from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government and the bill that funds the White House, the President's activities.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased this afternoon to rise to talk about that part of this conference report that covers the 2001 Treasury Postal Service and General Government appropriations bill. This is a bill that is strong on law enforcement. It is tough on guns and it supports a policy of zero tolerance on drugs.

Now, the President has said that he will sign all reasonable appropriation bills this Republican Congress sends to him.

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what he asked for. It is reasonable in every sense of the word, as I will attempt to describe here. Our part of this conference report is fiscally responsible and it is completely free of any and all controversial legislative riders.

Let me just take a moment to describe a little bit of the nuts and bolts of the measure. First of all, overall it has \$15.6 billion in support of the agencies that are covered by our appropriations subcommittee. It is \$1.9 billion, or 13.8 percent above the 2000 enacted level. It is 5.4 percent or \$900 million below the President's request but it is also \$1.228 billion above what we first initially passed in the House.

Some of the increases over the 2000 enacted levels include these: \$449 million for U.S. Customs Service, including not less than \$258 million for the badly needed Customs automation program, particularly the new one called ACE or Automated Customs Environment; \$204.9 million for the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms; \$423 million for IRS to support ongoing efforts for organizational modernization; \$15.2 million for the HIDTA, the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area program, a total of \$206.5 million for that; a \$10 million increase for the Drug Free Communities Act; \$142 million for the Secret Service to support their ongoing protective operations as well as the work that they do with school violence; a total of \$276 million as an advance appropriation for fiscal year 2002 for four new courthouses for a total of \$472 million in fiscal year 2001 for four new courthouse projects, two new border stations, the continuation of FDA consolidation and the construction of ATF headquarters.

Lastly, let me just mention that there is \$88 million to begin the work and restoration of the National Archives headquarters and protection of our charters of freedom.

In terms of legislative items as compared to the House-passed bill, this agreement does not include any provisions related to the Cuban sanctions. It does not include provisions related to the prohibition on the use of funds to

implement regulations clarifying what constitutes a satisfactory record of integrity and business ethics for Federal contractors, also known as the black listing provision. It does not include the provision prohibiting the use of funds to provide preferential treatment for the acquisition of firearms or ammunition. It does not include any provisions relating to reforms of the Federal Elections Commission, including the provision on the use of government aircraft by House and Senate candidates.

Conversely, this agreement does include current law from both the prohibition and use of funds for abortion as well as a requirement that health benefit plans provide contraceptive coverage. It does include a 1-year extension of the pilot project for child care and it does include current law as enacted in 1999 for the Kyoto protocol.

Mr. Speaker, I know that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going to cry foul about this bill. They are going to claim the conference agreement was put together in the dead of night without their participation.

Well, we did work long hours and indeed some of those hours were in the middle of the night in order to put together this responsible bill, but the truth is, and my colleagues know this, that they were invited to participate at every step of the way. For every meeting that was scheduled with the Senate, they and their staffs were invited to attend.

The fact is, they declined to participate. They declined our invitation to participate.

Now, I also suspect my colleagues will claim, as they already have, this bill is headed for a veto because it fails to fund must-have items requested in the President's budget. The fact is, we do not know if the President will veto this measure. Through the grapevine we have heard several variations of the position of the White House.

First, they thought this was a reasonable bill, albeit somewhat short when it came to funding new employees in the IRS. We were led to believe the administration wanted to add back or add an additional \$100 million. Then we heard the White House wanted \$300 million, some for IRS, some for Archives, some for Treasury law enforcement. Finally, we heard the White House does not really have a specific list of must-have programs they believe are underfunded but rather there is a general list of must-have items that now totals between \$729 million and \$783 million, more than half of which would go to courthouse construction.

Regardless of courthouses, this conference agreement funds 8 projects, one more than the President requested. Now, some will say that we are playing games with the numbers because we forward funded four projects. The fact is of those four projects, one of them, the largest one, in Miami at \$122 million, has a lot of controversy about it

and it has a difficult time in the authorization process. It made sense to actually forward fund this one.

Let us be honest about who is playing games and using gimmicks. It is not the Committee on Appropriations. There is one fact and one fact only that has kept us from passing this bill sooner. The White House will not give us a position on the bill. They will not specify what items which might cause them to veto this measure. They will not sit down and negotiate with us. In all my years on appropriations, I have not seen a time when the White House outright refused to give a position on the bill, but this is apparently the year where they simply refuse to come to the table and negotiate in good faith on this appropriation bill. I urge my colleagues to support this conference report so we can get on with the business of Congress.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and I are not managing this conference report, as was noted. In fact, it is being managed by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). That is a testimony to the process, the convoluted process, that has brought us to this floor today.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) rose and said that this was never considered in the legislative bill to be added. As far as I know, it was never considered in the legislative conference, not the conference that I participated in. At no time did the legislative conference meet and add this as a part of its bill.

I am on the legislative committee, at least as far as I was invited to. I do not know whether the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) was invited to a conference of the legislative committee or the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR), but I think the answer to that is no.

Notwithstanding that, I and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) have tried to work together to try to bring this bill to a point where we could all support it. Very frankly, I think that that is possible. I think it is still possible.

I talked to the Speaker about it just an hour and a half ago. I am sorry that we are here today in a mode of not being in agreement on this bill.

So, first of all, the process has been very convoluted. The Senate, of course, has not considered this bill on the floor and there was no real conference on a Senate bill and a House bill and the differences.

This process, from the very beginning, has been a difficult one, if not incorrect one. In the committee's report when we came to the floor on this bill, the committee said we needed \$1.3 billion more, I think they were correct, at least \$1.3 billion more, to meet the responsibilities of our committee and of the agencies that we fund.

That was the majority's observation, not mine. But they brought a bill to the floor which was \$464 million low on IRS. I am going to talk about that in a second. It ended up being more than that because we cut \$25 million on the floor to add to HDTAs. So it was \$491 million low on IRS when it left this House.

Now, we did not have convened a conference in the sense that we had two bills. There were meetings. That is correct. There were invitations to come to meetings, some of which were attended. The final conference or whatever conference occurred, I was not at. The perception of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is that is by choice. I think that is from his standpoint. I understand that perception. But it was also a choice that was made in the context that we really did not know what was going on, and there were no discussions with us as to exactly what was to be added. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) represents there were discussions with the White House. The White House is not for these numbers in this bill, still thinks they are substantially low, as I think the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) knows.

Now, the legislation bill comes back to us \$1.2 billion over what the House passed, mostly Republicans but some Democrats as well.

That \$1.2 billion was added essentially without participation of a full conference. That should not happen. There were an additional \$18.8 million that included projects and priorities of various Members, none of whom were Democrats on this side of the aisle. That should not happen.

Let us deal now with the IRS within the time frame that we have, because that is really the most important issue that we deal with in this bill. It is, after all, the agency that collects all the revenue that allows all of us who support a ready and appropriate national defense to fund it. Education, health services, law enforcement, all the other items for which government is responsible, IRS has to collect the money.

Now, we adopted a vision of a new IRS and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and others, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), a lot of others, brought this to the floor. We had a bill. We passed that bill.

The budget recommendations of the Portman report were, and I quote, the commission recommends that Congress provide the IRS certainty in its operational budget. We recommend the IRS budget for tax law enforcement and processing assistance and management be maintained at current levels.

Why? Because they said in order to carry out our responsibilities in passing this reform and restructuring bill, we need to have consistent and appropriate budget levels.

Now, around that time we hired a gentleman named Rossotti, Charles Rossotti. I think the chairman respects

Mr. Rossotti. I know I do. Furthermore, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) does, and Mr. ROTH does. They believe he is doing the kind of job that they expected to be done if we were going to meet our responsibilities under the Reform and Restructuring Act and have an IRS that was taxpayer friendly; that is to say that answered questions in a timely fashion, responded to taxpayers and were able to go personally over tax returns with taxpayers who had a particular problem.

□ 1500

After the conference was brought back to the floor and I expressed my concern that I had not seen the conference, had not talked about the conference, I asked Mr. Rossotti, I said does this allow you to do what we expect you to do? Here was his comment in a letter to me of September 8, 2000: "Please recognize that this level of funding, that is the funding level, that is provided for in this conference report, would lead to a further decline in the already low levels of compliance activity."

I have an article which indicates that some people are saying that there is \$300 billion in uncollected but due revenues. Why is that? Because compliance levels are so low and audit levels are shamefully low. I think the chairman knows that.

Mr. Rossotti, who is a Republican, hired as a manager, a business manager to carry out reform and restructuring and taxes modernization, says without funding for the Staffing Tax Administration for Balance and Equity Initiative, otherwise known as STABLE, the IRS effort to provide increased service to taxpayers and reduce the decline in audit coverage are at risk.

Substantively, the administration has a problem with this bill unrelated to politics. I share that view. So that in sum on the IRS title of this bill, we are dangerously low in providing services to the American taxpayer, and I had a discussion with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) on this. I think he shares my view that it is insufficient to carry out their duties.

Mr. Speaker, courthouses, the chairman mentioned the courthouses. The administration asks for seven courthouses to be funded. The conference report, frankly without discussion as to what courthouses we were talking about, came back and funded four courthouses. Now, that courthouse list is an interesting list: California, Washington, Virginia and ends with Mississippi; the next, D.C., Buffalo, Springfield, Miami. There is a list of 19 courthouses that are in the mix and deemed not by any politicians for pork purposes, but by the GSA and by the court administration as being priority needs.

We are not going to do all of those, but the conference, the so-called conference, again, without any discussion with me or other members on our side of the aisle, decided that we were going

to fund four and forward fund for others. Now, forward funding adopts the premise that these are necessary, but we are going to fund them next year. So, in effect, we are using next year's money this year. That is what forward funding means.

That is somewhat of a gimmick, a budget gimmick; and I know many of the conservative action team has decried budget gimmicks. But now guess what, and I hope that my conservative action team friends are listening, in addition to that, we have now moved the dates for paying veterans compensation, SSI, and other pensions from one year to another.

The problem with doing that is we changed it in the supplemental the other way just a few months ago. Now, I do not know how many people know that that is in this bill. It surely was not in the bill when it left here. It was never discussed in any conference in which I participated, and it was never informed to me that this was happening.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is probably a Member on the floor that knows that that has happened; maybe the chairman does, it has not been discussed.

In addition, we shift \$2 billion in this bill out of defense into nondefense domestic discretionary spending so that we can solve a firewall problem in the United States Senate. I cannot believe that the Contract With America that wanted to have a pristine process open and cleared to all without gimmicks that, of course, Democrats were alleged to perpetrate on the Congress, would support these provisions in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, one could go on for a long time and talk about the necessity of these bills; but one of the items that is not in this bill that the administration feels very strongly about and may well veto this bill on alone is the absence of the response to the counterterrorism initiative included in the administration's request.

There was some response in the conference report, but we left out the largest part of the administration's counterterrorism request. We think that is a problem.

The last thing I would indicate again in a process that is supposed to be an appropriations process, we have added a tax provision to this bill that was never discussed in the legislative conference. It was never discussed in any Treasury Postal conference, and anybody who gets on this floor and says that was a conferenced item that was agreed to by any conferees on the Democratic side in an open way is simply incorrect. It was never, ever discussed.

I would hope that my chairman would not make such a representation, because he knows that would be not true. I do not know how that provision became an emaculate conception on this bill, but it is now on this bill.

So for all of those reasons, I would hope that we would either recommit

this bill to conference and sit down and discuss it and come up with a bill on which we could all agree or, in the alternative, defeat this conference report.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to a few of the things said by my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend, who I have a great deal of respect for. We just happen to disagree about this bill and the way it has come to the body. I wished we could be in more complete agreement about it.

First, with regard to the funding for IRS. Let us be clear. We have an agency that has 95,000, that is 95,000 employees. It is not a small agency. It is also one in which I think most of us have recognized over the years, that is why we passed the modernization legislation, it has been one that has been too bureaucratic, too hard to move around, too difficult in order to get a handle on it. So I do not think that the issue really is adding more employees. It is making better use of the dollars, better use of technology, better use of management techniques more than anything else.

Mr. Speaker, I would also note with regard to the employees that were suggested to be added, that the President originally asked for this in the emergency supplemental. Now, they were not in there. He signed that bill. They were not in there, so all of this plan that is being asked for, the so-called program of STABLE, was going to be for annualizing these employees.

Since they were not there to begin with, we cannot be talking about analyzing them; but we cannot get a handle on what it is we really need. They will not tell us how much it is we really have to have. So we know that the amount that is requested for this program is wrong. It is not the correct amount, because it was to annualize a program that has not even begun.

We cannot start off with everybody on board in the first day.

Let me just talk about IRS accounts overall, and I think one of the things that I have learned as Chair of this committee, it is the biggest agency that we have. It is one of the hardest agencies to get your hands around and your arms around in terms of understanding it.

Mr. Speaker, now I think we have done a pretty good job in the information technology. We have had some bad times in the past, but we have been able to get a pretty good handle on the information technology account. But I do not think we are there yet with the personnel account, those that fund things such as processing and management and the enforcement.

We do not have a real good handle. We need to do better in that regard,

and that is why I think we need to work with Mr. Rossotti and managers at the IRS to get a better handle on exactly how this money they are asking for, this STABLE, for this new large number of 2,500 new employees would actually be used, and what they would actually do. We have not been able to really get a clear understanding of what this would be all about.

On construction, the gentleman from Maryland talked about forward funding and what a gimmick this is. Mr. Speaker, the President had in his request \$477 million of forward funding requested for the FDA consolidation mostly, but for some other GSA projects. So please, do not tell us that forward funding is a gimmick. It is a commitment by this body that we are going to do the next set of four courthouses.

And as I suggested, the one that is the largest by far in there is one that has not been authorized, has not been approved by the authorizing committee, and so it is not really in a position to go forward during the coming year anyhow.

Lastly, with regard to counterterrorism, in the emergency supplemental bill, we had \$55 million for counterterrorism. There is a request now for some additional amounts of money, but I do not think that this Congress has failed to step up to the plate, has failed to understand the need to have a strong effort in counterterrorism. Once again, we need to have a better idea of how this money is being used. We need to see where it is going before we just simply give a blank check to this administration or any other administration. That is our job as appropriators to do that.

I believe that this bill is a very responsible one. I believe it is one that Members of this body can and should support. And I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply say again the record is clear the administration wants additional money for the IRS. This bill provides and wants additional money to deal with the Puerto Rican elections, and it wants additional money to deal with antiterrorism.

This bill makes a substantial reduction in our antiterrorism appropriations. We had a lot of talk last year around New Year's about whether or not we expected terrorists activities. Those, in fact, did not occur. It is no accident that they did not occur.

We cannot talk in public about some of the things that the administration is trying to deal with in this category, but it would seem to me that before anyone considers reducing this account, they ought to have the briefing that the administration is asking to

provide, because I think it will bring into substantial question the decision made in this bill to cut that account.

Mr. Speaker, I would also simply say, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has already referred to this, I want to insert in the RECORD at this time an article entitled "Taxfree Millionaires by Donald Bartlett and James B. Steel."

[From the Washington Monthly, Sept. 2000]

TAX FREE MILLIONAIRES—HOW THE SUPER RICH GET AWAY WITHOUT PAYING ANY TAXES (By Donald L. Bartlett and James B. Steele)

Tax fraud is exploding in the United States. In ways large and small, Americans are cheating like never before. One of every three people, perhaps as many as one of every two, is doing it. It's one of Washington's dirty little secrets, a ticking time bomb with the potential to destroy the country's tax system and to undermine essential government programs like Social Security. Disguised by a robust economy and record tax collections, fraud is growing at an exponential pace among all groups, with more and more income concealed from the IRS each year.

How bad is it? No one can put a precise number on lost tax revenue. But it's bad, and getting worse. Even the IRS, which doesn't like to acknowledge this problem for fear it will only encourage more taxpayers to cheat, admitted in 1999 that the "tax gap," its euphemism for fraud and error, is now up to \$195 billion a year. But that is based on data from the 1980s. A more reasonable count of the revenue lost every year is \$300 billion.

If Tax Dodging Inc. were a business, it would be the nation's largest corporation, eclipsing General Motors, which sits atop the Fortune 500 with revenue of \$189 billion.

How do people escape paying the taxes they owe? They inflate their itemized deductions for everything from medical bills to charitable contributions. They manufacture deductions to cover expenses never incurred. They understate their income. Or they do both. They ship their money to foreign tax havens. They claim illegal refunds. They speculate in the stock market and don't report their gains. They charge off their personal living costs as business expenses. And many don't even bother to file tax returns at all.

How many nonfilers are there today? The IRS doesn't have a clue. In part, that's because Congress has slashed the agency's budget, halting the kind of audit that would make even crude projections possible. Informally, government tax authorities say there are 10 million nonfilers. In truth, there are many more, and here's why:

The IRS identifies a nonfiler as a person who fails to submit a tax return even though a third party has filed an earnings statement (W-2) or information return reporting interest or dividends (Form 1099) that shows the person received income during the year. This narrow definition ignores all those who leave no paper trail. These are the people for whom there are no W-2s, or 1099s, no record of wages, annuities, gambling winnings, pensions, interest, dividends, or money flowing in from foreign trusts and bank accounts.

In addition to these people who deal only in cash, there is another larger group whose numbers have soared. They are wealthy Americans and foreign citizens who live and work in the United States and in other countries—multinational wheeler-dealers, independent businesspeople, entertainers, fashion moguls and models. They have multiple passports or global residences and therefore insist they are exempt from the U.S. income tax.

People like the Wildensteins of New York City. That would be Alec and his former wife Jocelyne, who became a staple of the New York tabloids during an unseemly divorce that raged from the fall of 1997 until the spring of 1999.

Alec, born in 1940, is an heir to his family's century-old, intensely-private, multibillion-dollar international art business. Jocelyne, four years his junior, is best known for having undergone countless plastic surgery procedures that make her look more feline, permanently, than any member of the cast of Cats. Her bizarre appearance inspired the tabloids to dub her "The Bride of Wildenstein."

For the Wildensteins, the once impenetrable curtain that had protected the family from prying eyes for generations was unexpectedly pierced on the night of September 3, 1997, when Jocelyne returned to the couple's opulent Manhattan home after a visit to the family's 66,000-acre ranch in Kenya. Walking into the six-story townhouse on East 64th Street, next door to the Wildenstein gallery, a few minutes after midnight, she found her husband in bed with a nineteen-year-old, long-legged blonde.

Alec hastily wrapped himself in a towel, grabbed a 9mm handgun and pointed it at his wife and her two bodyguards. "I wasn't expecting anyone," he screamed with a touch of understatement. "You're trespassing. You don't belong here." The bodyguards summoned the police, who arrested Alec and charged him with three counts of second-degree menacing.

So it was that the French-born, aristocratic Alex Nathan Wildenstein, having traded his towel for an Armani suit and a monogrammed shirt, spent the night in the Tombs prison with some of New York's low life. If nothing else, the incarceration gave him time to plot his revenge. When he got out the next day, he moved quickly. He canceled his wife's credit cards. He cut off her telephone lines, locked all the rooms in the townhouse except for her bedroom and sitting room, shut off her access to bank accounts, directed the chauffeur to stop driving her around, fired her accountant, and, in one final act of retribution, ordered the household chefs to stop cooking for her, which proved a major inconvenience because she had never learned how to operate the stove.

Jocelyne responded by turning up the temperature a few hundred degrees on what had been one of the quietest divorce proceedings ever among the rich and discreet. As a result, life among the Wildensteins—a family that for more than a century had guarded its privacy with a pathological obsession—went on public display.

Jocelyne demanded a \$200,000 monthly living allowance, payment of her personal staff's salary and expenses, and a \$50 million security deposit pending distribution of the marital property. Alec pleaded poverty. He insisted he had no money of his own and that the millions they spent came from his father.

The Wildenstein Family Circus that followed established conclusively, one or more time, that the rich are very different from the rest of us, beyond the fact that they often pay comparatively little or no taxes. But first, some background on this intriguing family.

Alec is the son of Daniel Wildenstein, the patriarch of the enormously rich French clan. Daniel, born in 1918, controls the Wildenstein billions through a web of secret trusts and intertwined corporations. The Manhattan townhouses, for example, are owned in the name of the Nineteen East Sixty-Fourth Street Corporation, which in turn is controlled by "intermediate entities

held in trust." He continues to operate the private, secretive art business started by his grandfather in the nineteenth century, with galleries in New York, Beverly Hills, Tokyo, and Buenos Aires, catering to private collectors, museums, and galleries. And while he spends a lot of his time in Paris, a good chunk of his money resides in secret Swiss bank accounts.

Tucked away in family storerooms, notably in New York, is reportedly the world's largest private collection of the works of the masters—valued at \$6 billion to \$10 billion. The inventory includes thousands of paintings and drawings by Renoir, Van Gogh, Cezanne, Gauguin, Rembrandt, Rubens, El Greco, Caravaggio, da Vinci, Picasso, Manet, Bonnard, Fragonard, Monet, and others. Many have never been displayed publicly.

In 1990, Daniel's sons Alec and Guy took over management of the New York gallery. Their families maintained separate living quarters in the East 64th Street townhouse. They shared the swimming pool in the basement, the informal and formal dining rooms, the foyer, elevator, and the entrance to the townhouse. Alec and Jocelyne lived on the third floor, their two children had bedrooms on the fifth floor, and Jocelyne used the sixth floor as an office. In addition to the Manhattan townhouse, they maintained a castle, the chateau Marienthal, outside Paris, an apartment in Switzerland, and the Kenya ranch.

Wherever they happened to be, the Wildensteins pursued a lifestyle that was lavish even by the standards of the rich and famous. The details, as they poured from Jocelyne's lips in the divorce proceeding, told the story of a family of seemingly unlimited wealth and no hesitation about spending it. According to her, she and Alec "routinely wrote checks and made withdrawals" from their Chase Manhattan Bank checking account "for \$200,000 to \$250,000 a month." Jocelyne said that over the last 20 years they did "millions of dollars worth of renovations on the Paris castle and Kenya ranch," and she directed the management, hiring, and staffs of those properties. The routine operating costs of the ranch alone ran \$150,000 a month.

In New York, Jocelyne's staff payroll at the 64th street townhouse included \$48,000 a year for a chambermaid; \$48,000 for a maid who tended the dogs; \$60,000 each for a butler and chauffeur; \$84,000 for a chef; \$102,000 for an assistant with an MBA; and \$102,000 for a secretary.

In Kenya, their vast Ol Jogi ranch, with its two hundred buildings spread over an area five times the size of Manhattan, required nearly four hundred employees to look after the grounds and the animals.

In France, the resident staff at the chateau, "the largest private home of its type within a fifteen-minute drive of Paris," included five gardeners, three concierges, and three maids.

Talk did not come cheap for the Wildensteins. The annual telephone bill in Manhattan alone sometimes ran as high as \$60,000. And then there were all the other necessities, like \$547,000 for food and wine; \$36,000 for laundry and dry cleaning; \$60,000 for flowers; \$42,000 for massages; pedicures, manicures, and electrolysis; \$82,000 to insure here jewelry and furs, and \$60,000 to cover the veterinarian bills, medication, pet food, beds, leashes, and coats for their dogs. As for miscellaneous professional services, \$24,000 went for a dermatologist, \$12,000 for the dentist, and \$36,000 for pharmaceuticals. Her American Express and Visa card bills for one year totaled \$494,000.

Some of these bills were paid out of the couple's Chase Manhattan account. Some were paid out of "other bank accounts in

New York, Paris, and Switzerland." And some bills, Alec confirmed, were paid from "the Wildenstein & Co." account, "the Wildenstein & Co. Special Account, and family businesses." Sort of like having your employer pick up the cost of your clothing, pets, and vacations.

And then there were Jocelyne's personal expenditures. Over the years, she accumulated jewelry valued at \$10 million, including a thirty-carat diamond ring and custom pieces from Cartier. She attended fashion shows in Paris. Her annual spending on clothing and accessories ran to more than \$800,000. She once spent \$350,000 for a Chanel outfit that she helped to design. Al told, according to papers filed in the divorce case, the couple's personal and household expenditures added up to well over \$25 million in 1995 and 1996 alone.

With all those tens of millions of dollars flowing out over the years to maintain a lifestyle beyond comprehension to most people—\$60,000 in dog bills exceeds the annual income of three-fourths of all working Americans who pay taxes—you might think that Alec and Jocelyne also forked over millions of dollars to the Internal Revenue Service. But you would be wrong.

They didn't pay a penny in U.S. income tax.

In fact, they never filed a federal tax return.

These admissions by a family accountant are spelled out in records of the acrimonious divorce and also entered into court opinions. They lived the tax-free life even though, by Jocelyne's account, they resided in the Manhattan townhouse for nineteen years, from shortly after their Las Vegas marriage in 1978 until the rancorous divorce proceedings began in 1997. Their children were born in New York and went to school in New York. Alec conducted the family art business through Wildenstein & Co., Inc., a New York corporation, from the gallery next door. He had a U.S. pilot's license. He sued and was sued in the courts of New York and other states. He signed documents moving millions of dollars between Wildenstein companies, some located in the tax havens of the world. He transacted business in New York and other states. He was vice-president of Nineteen East Sixty-Fourth Street Corporation, which owns the townhouse, gallery, and other properties. His New York pistol license identified him as an officer of Wildenstein & Co. And following his arrest for pointing the weapon at Jocelyne and her bodyguards, he insisted that he should be released on his own recognizance because of his substantial ties to the community.

Nonetheless, he filed no federal tax returns. And no one in Washington or New York noticed. Or cared. Under ordinary circumstances, even the complex tax returns of the very wealthy that are filed go unchecked. That's due to a deliberate decision by Congress to starve the IRS, both in operating funds and in manpower and expertise to conduct such audits. So forget about ferreting out serious nonfilers among the rich and prominent. That task doesn't even register on the tax fraud radar screen. Not surprisingly, representatives of Alec Wildenstein declined to discuss his tax affairs. Jocelyne's lawyer said she doesn't know anything about taxes, since Alec controlled the money. And the IRS can't comment on the tax matters of private citizens. Or in this case, the non-tax matters.

In the divorce case, Alec argued that he was not a resident of the United States, that he had a Swiss passport and visited this country on a tourist visa, and that he did not have a green card permitting him to work. Furthermore, he contended that he had "less than \$75,000 in bank accounts" and that "my

only earnings are approximately \$175,000 per year." On a net-worth statement, Alec listed his occupation as "unpaid personal assistant to father Daniel Wildenstein." That stirred the ire of State Supreme Court Judge Marilyn G. Diamond, who presided over the hostilities. "He fails to explain why he is unpaid," said Diamond, adding that "this contention insults the intelligence of the court and is an affront to common sense."

Judge Diamond was also angered that Alec never bothered to attend the divorce hearings. Shortly after Jocelyne began unveiling intimate details of the couple's private life, he fled the country. He ignored repeated court dates, failing to appear to answer either the gun charges or his wife's allegations. At one hearing, an irritated Diamond excoriated Wildenstein in absentia for his refusal to obey court orders and to attend depositions. His attorney, Raoul L. Felder, the New York celebrity divorce lawyer, offered an explanation for his client's behavior:

"It may not be his disinclination to appear before the court. You are aware there are substantial tax problems we believe created by the plaintiff."

Judge Diamond agreed. "There are going to be more substantial tax problems," she said. "There are more substantial potential tax problems by people continuing to take certain positions. Make no mistake about it."

If this conjures up visions of battalions of vigilant IRS agents engaged in a relentless search to identify tax scofflaws and, when they do so, dun them for the taxes they owe, assess interest and penalties, seize their bank accounts and cars, freeze their assets, and auction off their possessions, well, that's what they are, visions—at least when it comes to the very rich. For the double standard is to tax-law enforcement what rock is to roll.

Suppose you earn \$40,000 a year and don't file a return. When the IRS catches up with you it prepares a substitute return, estimates your income, calculates the tax you owe, tacks on interest and penalties, and sends you the bill. If you don't like their numbers, you must prove that the IRS is incorrect. What's more, the agency may seize your bank accounts, your car, and whatever else you have of value.

Not so with the truly prosperous. First, the agency mails out a computer-generated letter asking the nonfiler to submit a return. When the reluctant recipient fails to respond, a second letter goes out. And then another. And another. If the silence persists, IRS resorts to another tactic: The telephone. It tries to find the number of the missing nonfiler and place a series of calls. When all that proves futile—it generally does nothing. Nothing?

That was a finding of a 1991 study by the General Accounting Office (GAO), the investigative arm of Congress, that examined IRS' handling of affluent nonfilers:

"The IRS does not fully investigate high-income nonfilers, which creates an ironic imbalance. Unlike lower income nonfilers in the Substitute for Returns program, high-income nonfilers who do not respond to IRS' notices are not investigated or assessed taxes. Even if high-income nonfilers eventually file tax returns, their returns receive less scrutiny than those who file returns on time."

What's the IRS's explanation for the double standard? Incredibly, it told GAO that it does not prepare a substitute return for rich nonfilers, as it does for middle-income people, because it fears that it might "understate taxes owed." In other words, no loaf is better than half-a-loaf. So do nothing. Second, GAO said, "to pursue more high-income

cases, IRS would need additional staff." Which, of course, is precisely what Congress refuses to provide.

But things have changed since the critical 1991 audit that tried to prod the IRS to act, right? Indeed they have. With each passing year, the number of affluent nonfilers has gone up while Congress has slashed the service's auditing capabilities. There is no better evidence of the agency's breakdown than the fact the Wildensteins went two decades without filing a tax return, and the IRS knew nothing about it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the article points out that tax fraud is a ticking time bomb in this country, probably approaching up to \$300 billion in lost revenue. It tells the story of one family worth billions of dollars, one family that holds, in art collections alone, over \$6 billion in assets. They have a town house, a swimming pool. They have property in Kenya and France. They spend tens of millions of dollars each year.

They spend \$65,000 just in dog bills. They have not even filed a tax return for the last 20 years, and the IRS did not even know about it. That is the kind of tax avoidance which the IRS ought to be able to track, and so as long as they do not have adequate resources, will not be able to track.

If you are some taxpayer paying \$30,000 a year and they caught you, you would get womped with a bill in a hurry. But here is an example of a family that has lived like kings, international multinational kings, for years, in full view; and they have paid not one dime in taxes and never even bothered to file.

□ 1515

This is no laughing matter, when the administration is asking for more money to fund the IRS. So I would suggest that for those two reasons alone, this bill still falls far short of where it ought to be.

I also do not see why we should continue to play a flip-flop game with SSI. Last year we decided, the Congress decided, it was going to move the date for the payment of SSI checks into one fiscal year. The Congress moved it back to a different fiscal year in the supplemental this year. Now it is trying to flip it back again, moving it to a different fiscal year again, not for substance purposes, but for political purposes. All that does is create confusion and bring into question whether or not those SSI checks are going to be able to be cut. We ought not do that. That is another reason why this bill ought not to be considered in this fashion.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond to a couple things that the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations said. He used the word "cutting," that this bill is cutting. But I think we should be clear that we may not be adding as much as he would like in terms of new spending, but at 13.8 percent over last

year's spending, it is hardly a cut. There are not cuts in this in virtually every account, there are additions, and most of them are very much needed, and we acknowledge that. But this is not cuts.

The second point, with regard to the matter of IRS law enforcement or enforcement that the gentleman from Wisconsin talked about, the President's proposal would have transferred \$43 million out of law enforcement into other areas. We did not permit him to do that. So if there is inadequate law enforcement, I think the problem is to be found in the White House and in the administration and their plans to try to reduce the enforcement part of the Internal Revenue Service.

The third point, with regard to counter-terrorism, the additional monies, as I mentioned, we have \$55 million in this bill that is emergency spending so it can be spent immediately, above and beyond the budget caps. We offered in our discussions with the minority as we were trying to get agreement on this, we offered to put an additional \$37.2 million, which is more than two-thirds of what the President thought was additionally required in this area. That offer was rejected.

Again, we have not heard, other than that just absolutely everything is needed, there is no negotiation to be done except to give us 100 percent, that has been the bottom line of everything we have had in the discussions here, and that is not what I would call a serious negotiation.

So I think we have been very, very generous, and certainly are going to be prepared to look at additional amounts as we go forward from here. But certainly this conference report deserves support.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman indicated that they offered to put back additional money. They may have offered, but the fact is they have not put it back. So we are not voting on some ethereal offer; we are voting on the legislation before us at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say to my colleagues, I really think had we had the opportunity to work on this bill a little longer, I know we have been working on it for 10 days, but, very frankly, we could have done this 8 months earlier had we had real numbers at the start and not been told this is the 1st inning and there are 8 innings left to go. I do not know whether it is the 6th or 7th inning, but, very frankly, this is premature consideration, if you will, because we could work this out. I think we are pretty close to working this out, but we are certainly not close, as the ranking member indicated, with not having added what has been offered by your side to add. That is not added here. We are not close to funding IRS.

Let me say something about the chairman's comment about the level of employees of IRS. Let me remind you, he said there were 95,000 IRS employees. In 1992 there were 116,000 IRS employees. What has happened since 1992? Obviously, as the gentleman points out, they have been reduced 20 percent in the level of employees. That happened.

Number two, we have millions of additional taxpayers.

Number three, the complexity of the returns has increased as a result, very frankly, of some of the tax bills offered by the Republican majority which have become law.

Fourthly, we adopted a Restructuring and Reform Act which said we want you to be more customer friendly; that is to say, we want you to give more services, we want you to answer questions more quickly, we want you to be more available for taxpayers to come in to regional offices, all of which were positive things. But then we turn around and we say, guess what though? You do not have any people to do it.

That is a shell game. It is dishonest. That is why I voted against the Reform and Restructuring Act the first time around, and it is one of the best speeches I ever gave, and it was a very short speech. I got up and I said if you want to be for taxpayer IRS reform, you need to be for IRS reform at tax writing time and at budget time.

That is what this report ultimately said. In this bill, we are \$305 million under what Mr. Rossotti, not the administration, asked for. Frankly, Mr. Rossotti asked for more money than this to do his job. So do not go home and tell your taxpayers, boy, we are providing the kind of service that you need, because we are on your side, we are taxpayer friendly, and then pretend that you can go from 116,000 IRS employees to serve 270 million Americans, and, sure, it sounds like a big number, until you decide that there are 270 million Americans that are covered. They do not all pay taxes, some are kids, some do not make enough money, but they are all in the mix. And you go down to 95,000, and then expect to say, oh, well, you can do it.

I agree with my chairman, and he and I are good friends and respect one another, and I respect the big chairman, the chairman of the full committee. I think we can work this out. I think we can get pretty close, and I think we can get the administration on board. We did not participate in most of this. Yes, we discussed it, yes, I know the chairman is frustrated by the fact that we have not reached agreement. But you should not have brought this bill forward today, because it would have served the process and our committee if in fact we had worked this bill out and come to the floor together and said we have done what we should have done on IRS, we have done what we should on counter-terrorism, we have done what we should on court houses, and very frankly, we may stay

where we are on court houses, with some additional discussion the chairman and I have had.

But I would urge my colleagues, this is not the bill we ought to pass. In my opinion, and the President has not told me this, it is not going to be signed. And why do we continue in the 7th or 8th inning, or the 10th or 11th inning, wherever we are in this inning process, Mr. Chairman, I do not know where we are, but wherever we are, we should bring it to closure through agreement, and we are prepared to do that. We want to do it, I think we can do it, I would hope we would do it. I would hope we would send this bill back to a conference, that is a strange conference, because the Senate has never considered this bill. To that extent there was really nothing in the conference other than our bill, and in fact we did not conference our bill, it was added to the Legislative bill, which is why it is there.

So, my colleagues, I ask you to reject this. We can do better, and we will do better, and, when we do better, this bill will be whole, all of it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I hope this may conclude my part of the debate, but I do feel I need to respond to a few of the things that have just been said in this debate.

A few moments ago we had the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) pointing out that the counter-terrorism dollars were not in here, that we are not voting on something hypothetical, we have to be voting on the substance of this. In the next moment the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is talking about how the process was not good. So we are talking about the process, not the substance of it. We are kind of getting whipsawed on both sides of this thing here.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have concerns about both the process and the substance, which is why we mentioned both.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the bottom line is is this a responsible bill? The question that we should ask is not does this bill have exactly everything in it that I want, because that is not the way the legislative process works; it is is this a responsible bill? And nobody can look at this bill and say that this is not a responsible bill. It does not do everything that I would like, because in the process of being chairman, I have to give on some things. It does not do everything that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) would like, it does not do everything that the White House would like, but it is a responsible bill. It funds in an adequate way the agencies that we are responsible for.

The gentleman from Maryland has told us that this bill will not be signed

by the President. That is somewhat news to us, because we have never been able to get a definitive statement from the White House about that. I do not want to be in the business of passing legislation, these appropriations bills, and going through this process of having them vetoed. I want to get bills that can be signed. But, as I said at the outset, our problem is the White House will not tell us. They have said in no uncertain terms, they will not tell us what it is that they need in order to pass this, other than, of course, give us everything in the request.

So we have to at some point pass a bill so we can get in writing from the White House some kind of a definitive statement about what it is. Perhaps we can do that before we send it to the White House. After we pass it and send it to the White House, perhaps we can work that out, because there are going to be other appropriations bills and other parts of this could be worked out in supplemental or omnibus bills at the end, other appropriation bills and conference reports.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have a bill that is responsible. I believe we have a conference report that should be supported. I believe that the White House, and I hope the minority, would join us in passing this, so we can move forward and get this legislation enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the work of the staff of my subcommittee: Michelle Mrdeza, the clerk; Kurt Dodd, Jeff Ashford, and Tammy Hughes, and Patricia Schlueter of the minority staff. I would also like to thank Kevin Messner of my personal staff, and Scott Nance, on the staff of Mr. HOYER.

In addition to acknowledging the work of staff who have contributed to getting this Conference Report before the House today, let me give a special thanks to Doug Burke, a special Agent with U.S. Secret Service who is detailed to the Subcommittee as a congressional fellow. Doug came to this assignment after serving for a year as a fellow in the office of my distinguished ranking member, Mr. HOYER. He has brought considerable skill and energy to bear on our legislative work, to include preparing for hearings, conducting detailed oversight analysis, and coordinating two important Committee oversight trips to Miami and the West Coast, where his secret skills as a jazz pianist were exposed. In addition to serving as a full working staff member for the subcommittee, Mr. Burke did extra duty in doing Secret Service advance duty for the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia during the last recess.

Mr. Burke, who grew up in the Washington Virginia suburbs as the son of a former Secret Service Assistant Director, began his government service in the U.S. Navy, and went on from there to graduate from Penn State University. His subsequent career in the Secret Service has included investigative field work in Miami, protective service on the Presidential Detail, and teaching assignments at the Secret Service's Rowley Training Center in Beltsville, Maryland and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Georgia.

I would like to thank Mr. Burke for his contributions to the work of the Subcommittee and

wish him well in his future career as he returns this fall to the Secret Service. I would also wish him especially the best as Doug, the father of three, prepares with his wife Sarah to bring a new Burke into the world next year.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to simply say it is simply not true that the White House has not indicated what they want to see with this bill. They have indicated they want to see more funds for the IRS, they have indicated they want to see more funds for counterterrorism, they have indicated they want additional funds in order to deal with the Puerto Rican election.

They have indicated that they also do not want to have a non-germane separate tax provision which has no business in this bill being considered in this kind of a three-headed package. They have suggested that if indeed that tax package is going to be considered, then it ought to be considered along with other tax items, including some of the tax items that the administration is interested in several other appropriation bills. So they made it very clear what they regard to be the deficiencies in this bill, and I do not think it ought to be asserted otherwise.

Secondly, I would simply say I think the gentleman from Arizona has negotiated in absolute good faith, but I think he has had the rug pulled out from under him, just as we have on this side of the aisle, by the decision of his leadership to proceed in partisan fashion to pass this bill with votes on that side of the aisle alone. I regret that, but that, nonetheless, is apparently what has happened today, and until the substance of the bill is fixed, we do not intend to participate.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me say, so the Members understand where we are going to be I think at the end game, if we had continued our discussions about how to resolve this, and so the public understands as well, our constituents understand, I believe we can agree, I believe the White House can agree, on a number for this bill that will still be more than one-half billion dollars under the President's request.

□ 1530

I hope my colleagues heard that. I believe the White House is prepared to sign a bill that is half a billion, almost \$600 million under what they submitted to this Congress. So it is not that they are asking, gee, we ought to include all of these additional dollars.

It was, and I want to repeat, in the committee report issued by the majority in the Congress, the Republican majority. It says that their allocation was \$1.3 billion too little to meet the priorities. Now, that was still, we understand, \$800 million less than the President asked for, which was 2.2.

They are adding 1.2 back. So there is still \$100 million under what the committee report said they thought, the Republicans thought, was necessary to adequately fund this bill.

I repeat again to the chairman, for whom I have great respect, as everyone on this floor knows, we work together closely, I think we can work this thing out; and I know he is frustrated that we have been at it for 8 or 9 days and have not been able to work it out. There are a lot of interests here. The tax provision that was added to this bill, totally extraneous to our bill, has caused us a problem. That is not of the making of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) or my making or the making of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) or the making of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG); but it is causing us a problem, and that needs to be worked out. But we ought not to go up the hill just to be shot down and have to go back up it again.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can reach an agreement that is almost \$600 million under the President's request, and I would urge us to do that. Reject this conference report and approve the motion to recommit to conference. Let us sit down at the table, reason together and come up with a reasonable, positive, productive bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report included, as I said in my opening remarks, three different sections. One is the repeal of the Spanish-American War excise tax on telephone costs which passed this House by a vote of 420 to 2. So I take it that the substance of this portion of this legislation is not an issue. The Legislative Branch appropriations part of this package passed the House 373 to 50.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me make clear, that is an issue, because the administration indicates that if that tax is to be considered, and it ought to be considered in conjunction with other changes in the tax law which the administration also wants, not unilaterally in a privileged position, without any of the administration's tax preferences being taken into account. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his comments, but I think a vote of 420 to 2 is a pretty good indication of how the Members of this House feel about repealing that Spanish-American War tax.

Most of the debate has centered around the other bill that I indicated earlier passed by a landslide, relatively speaking, because it had 14 more votes for it than it had against it. Now, on this Treasury Postal, General Government bill, that is almost a landslide, based on previous votes procedural problems were mentioned because of the adding of the Treasury Postal bill

to the Legislative Branch conference report. That is probably not the best procedure, but we are a bicameral legislature. We have to work with the other body at the other end of the Capitol, as well as working with the President when we complete our conference reports.

The Senate was of the opinion that they needed to add the Treasury Postal bill into the Legislative Branch conference report, so that is what we did. I would not have done that if the House had not passed the Treasury Postal bill. I would not agree to taking any bill and putting in another conference if the House had not already passed it, except under the most unusual circumstances. I just believe I owe that to the Members of the House to give them that protection. So I would not do that. However, if that is what has to be done on the part of the other body to get a bill through the process, then that is what we will do.

It had been suggested that the IRS issue is a big issue, but I want the Members to know that we spent quite a bit of time talking about that. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is my dear friend and I have tremendous respect for him and his abilities, he is great; and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who is also my friend and has great ability and talent; and I know a lot of people that watch these debates might wonder, well, how do these guys ever get along together? Just because we have different opinions does not mean that we do not respect each other, because I respect both of those gentlemen. We work together.

In fact, we sat down with the Speaker of the House before we brought this conference report to the floor and one of the issues we discussed was the issue of the additional money for the Internal Revenue Service. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House, gave his word to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) that if we pass this bill, that he would be willing to guarantee that the additional money for the Internal Revenue Service would be added to a subsequent appropriations bill.

Now, we talked a lot about that; and we were unable to come to a conclusion, so we made the determination to move ahead with this bill. We have talked a lot, and I know it was mentioned that maybe we should keep on talking. Well, unless the plan is just to delay the legislation and delay it and delay it, eventually we get to the point that it is time to end the talking, and it is time to take some action, and we think we are at that point.

When we went to the subcommittee on the Treasury Postal bill back in July, 2 months ago, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and myself, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) sat down and we talked with each other about several

issues that were important to Members and had those conversations before we did the subcommittee markup.

Again, prior to the time that we took the subcommittee markup to the full committee, the joint leadership, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker; the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader; the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader; the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and myself, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and some of the other leaders sat down together in the Speaker's Office, and we talked about some of the issues in this bill. And we talked for a long time, and we decided to proceed with marking up that bill in the full committee. We have done that. We have brought it to the floor and we passed it. We have done a lot of talking. It is now time to take some action.

This is a bill that I think meets the requirements, as we see them today. Should there be some adjustments? The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) had made a firm commitment to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and I know the Speaker of the House to be an honorable man, a man whose word can be taken as truth. If he gives his word, he keeps his word. He made a commitment to the gentleman from Maryland of what he would be willing to do on a subsequent bill to make this bill more attractive to the minority party.

So I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we would reject the motion to recommit, and I am told it will be a clean motion to recommit; there will be no instructions. I would say to the gentleman from Maryland I appreciate that, because I believe that that does save us some time here today, and we do have some other appropriations issues to deal with, such as appointing conferees on other bills that we can get into conference and bring back to the House. But reject the motion to recommit the bill, and then let us pass the bill.

Now, if it goes to the White House and the President decides he wants to veto it, so be it. We will deal with that. But as of today, the President and no one in the White House has been willing to tell the subcommittee chairman of this bill that he would veto the bill. Neither the President nor any of his staff has told the chairman of the full committee, this Member, that he would veto this bill. Just this morning, the Speaker of the House communicated with the White House. He was not told that the President would veto this bill. So we are proceeding in good faith. We think that we have worked out a bill here that meets our responsibilities and does it in a very effective way.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can get on to passage of this bill, and then get to work on the other conference reports that have to be considered and get them to the President so that he

has adequate time to consider them before the fiscal year expires at the end of September.

So I ask all of my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin and I have had suggestions and in the interest of time, I think we will not, in light of the fact that the motion to recommit is probably redundant in terms of the vote on passage, we will not offer the motion to recommit so that we do not take the additional time of Members.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for that, and I think that helps us expedite the business which needs to be expedited.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I just ask the Members to seriously consider this package, and let us vote it out of the House, get it through the Senate, and send it down to the White House and let the President make his decision once he sees the bill in its final form.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, while there are still areas of this bill that need to be revised, I would like to commend the Conference Committee Members for including in this report \$5 million for the Nazi War Crimes Disclosure Act's Interagency Working Group. This funding is vital to the work of the Interagency Working Group responsible for diligently reviewing documents regarding the atrocities of World War II and making those records available to the public. I applaud Senator DEWINE for successfully securing this funding in the Senate version of the bill and then working with the Conference Committee to retain this funding.

In 1994, I introduced the Nazi War Crimes and Disclosure Act with Chairman STEVE HORN in the House and with the leadership of Senator DEWINE in the Senate. After several hearings held by the Government Reform Committee and wide community support, this bill became law in 1998.

Recently the Government Reform Committee, under the leadership of Chairman HORN, held a hearing to announce some of the findings from the Interagency Working Group's efforts. At this hearing, we heard firsthand how critical funding is to the future efforts of the Interagency Working Group as they begin reviewing classified documents regarding Japanese War Crimes.

The Interagency Working Group has successfully released more than 1.5 million documents to the public. While this is an impressive accomplishment, the IWG has succeeded without the support of Congress. This has led to inadequate staff support and the inability to preserve and protect the deteriorating and crumbling documents.

This conference report before us will be the first time Congress has stepped up to fully support the work of the Interagency Working Group. Already, significant new information about the Holocaust has been revealed in the more than 400,000 Office of Strategic Services records released by the Interagency Working Group at the National Archives this past June, but that is only the beginning. Without the support of historians and trained staff,

we only have a small glimpse of the information contained in those documents.

It is essential that the Archivist use all of the earmarked \$5 million dollars which is authorized in this legislation for the explicit purpose of supporting the efforts of the Interagency Working Group so that they may restore decaying documents, afford historians and trained staff, and to help the Archives make these documents available to the public. The report before us contains \$14 million more for the National Archives than the previously passed House version. It is my understanding that this increase was included to provide adequate funding for this expenditure.

I therefore urge my colleagues to preserve this provision in the bill and support the vital work of the Interagency Working Group.

While there is still a lot of debate surrounding the Legislative Branch/Treasury Postal Appropriations conference report before us today, and there are many issues that must still be resolved, I rise to highlight two specific provisions in this bill that I strongly support.

First, I am proud that this conference report contains a provision I authored which requires the Office of Personnel and Management to study the positive impact of providing federal employees with paid paternal leave.

This study means progress!

In May, I, along with Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HOYER of Maryland, and Mr. GILMAN of New York, introduced H.R. 4567, the Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act of 2000. This bipartisan bill would give federal employees 6 weeks of paid parental leave for the birth or adoption of a child—a benefit that the majority of private sector employers already give their employees.

Since we introduced the bill in May, I have heard from men and women across the country who have relayed their stories to me about the great impact this legislation would have on their families. They have told me that they will no longer be forced to make a choice: whether to stay home with an ill newborn or to put food on the table.

In response to this overwhelming support, we have asked OPM to conduct a study to understand the importance of providing paid parental leave to federal employees. This study will help us understand and quantify why H.R. 4567 is so important. It will also likely reveal that the federal government will become more competitive with the private sector by offering paid parental leave. It may also show that the government's recruitment efforts will be boosted and that the costs related to turnover and replacement will be greatly reduced. Finally, this study will conclude that the federal workforce can win back dedicated and qualified workers to the government if we offer a benefit that is already being offered by the majority of private sector companies.

Everyone always says that the federal government should be run more like a business. This study will lay the foundation for the federal government to do just that.

Let's keep this provision in the bill and show our federal employees that we care about them and support their families.

I am also extremely pleased that we were able to find additional resources for this conference report to adequately fund the activities of the General Accounting Office. The funding included in this appropriation will guarantee that the GAO will be able to continue to produce the high quality, objective reports that we have come to expect.

In recent years, the GAO has experienced severe budget cuts even as the demand for their services has grown. Since 1992, the GAO has been forced to reduce its workforce by 40%. Nonetheless, the quality of their work has never wavered. As a Member of the Government Reform Committee, I have frequently had the opportunity to see the GAO in action and have been constantly impressed by the quality and professionalism of their reports and testimony. Recently, the GAO's oversight of the decennial census has reminded me again of the fantastic, impartial work that the GAO consistently provides. I commend them for their work.

I strongly believe that this agency is one of our best resources in the quest to make government run more efficiently. In fact, for every dollar invested in the GAO, taxpayers save more than \$57.

The funding included in this legislation will guarantee that the GAO will be able to hire necessary personnel to meet ever-increasing Congressional demands and continue to provide the services we have come to expect.

I applaud the inclusion of these resources and hope that next year we can find the resources for the GAO without hurting the funding of the other agencies we rely on every day.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support these provisions included in the Conference Report. Even though other measures in this particular report will prevent me from supporting this bill, I look forward to working with my colleagues to retain these provisions and work toward a conference report that will have full support.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report which contains language that seeks to close a loophole regarding the safety of child care in Federal facilities throughout this country. I would like to thank Mrs. MALONEY and Mrs. MORELLA for their support of this issue and their dedication to improving the quality of child care for all children.

Congress passed the Crime Control Act in 1990 which included a provision calling for mandatory background checks of employees hired by a Federal agency. However, some agencies have interpreted the law in such a way that many child care employees are not subjected to these background checks.

Currently, Federal employees across the country undergo, at the bare minimum, a computer check of their background which includes FBI, Interpol and State police records. However, some child care workers who enter these same buildings on a daily basis do not. Federal employees who use federally provided child care should feel confident that these child care providers have backgrounds free of abusive and violent behavior that would prevent them from working with children.

Moreover, this amendment helps to ensure the overall safety of our Federal buildings. Child care workers step into Federal buildings each day and look after children of Federal employees. Without performing background checks, the children in day care, as well as the employees in Federal facilities, are exposing themselves to possible violent attacks in the workplace. A child care worker with a history of violent criminal behavior has the opportunity to create a terrorist situation the likes of which have not been seen since the tragedy in Oklahoma City.

Child care providers working in Federal facilities throughout the country have somehow

fallen through the cracks and have become exempt from undergoing a criminal history check. This amendment corrects this situation. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4516, the FY 2001 Legislative Branch/Treasury-Postal Conference Report.

This mini-omnibus appropriations bill is business as usual and I did not come to Congress to engage in business as usual. The people of Kansas' third district expect and deserve more of us. As Congress has done for too many years, today it will be voting on a bill that violates both the rules of the House and the Senate in the name of political expediency.

Under these rules, Congress is supposed to consider 13 appropriations bills for each fiscal year. Under normal procedures, those bills should come before the House and the Senate individually, with opportunities for amendment and debate. After a conference report is negotiated, the House should then have the opportunity to vote on each bill, standing alone. Unfortunately, Congress has refused to follow its own rules. The majority party has combined two appropriations bills in this so-called conference report—one of which has yet to be considered by the full Senate.

I have only been a Member of this body for 18 months, but I understand that these rules and procedures were put in place to protect the rights of all Members to represent fully the interests and concerns of our constituents. We cannot do so when we are confronted with an omnibus conference report which rolls together a number of provisions, that one of our two deliberative bodies has not had the opportunity to fully consider.

While the process under which this bill has been considered is unacceptable, it does contain many programs which I have fought for and for which I would vote under normal circumstances. I am pleased that this bill contains provisions that strongly support law enforcement efforts in this country. Fully funding the administration's gun-law-enforcement initiatives, including a proposal to add 600 employees to the agency to more fully enforce existing gun laws, suggests that this Congress is finally getting serious about stopping the scourge of gun crimes that have crippled this nation.

This bill also contains a provision that I strongly support which would roll back the 0.5 percent surcharge on Federal employee retirement contributions. This increase was mandated by the 1997 balanced budget law and has disproportionately affected Federal employees by taxing more of their gross income for retirement than their private sector counterparts contribute. Mr. Speaker, the budget is balanced: it is time to stop funding surpluses at the expense of our hard working Federal employees.

Finally, I strongly support the provision in this bill that would repeal the 3 percent telephone excise tax that was levied as a luxury tax over 100 years ago to fund the Spanish American War. Mr. Speaker, the war is over and, with over 94 percent telephone ownership, this service is no longer a luxury. It is past time to repeal this tax and I voted to do so back in May when the House first considered this issue. I am disappointed that the majority party chose to hold this important issue hostage by marrying it with this controversial

measure. While I support many of the priorities in this bill, I remain concerned about one provision in this bill that suggest this Congress is not serious about holding the line on spending.

Mr. Speaker, about a decade ago, through legislative slight of hand, Congress passed a law to allow for the automatic annual increase in Members' salaries. This was a politically motivated move to shield Congress from casting embarrassing votes to increase their own pay. While we were technically afforded the opportunity to vote against an increase by casting a no vote on a procedural issue, the fact remains that by voting in support of this legislation, we will be voting for our own pay raises.

This will be a vote that comes at the expense of other mandates an earlier Congress created: Two years ago the House voted overwhelmingly for the IRS Reform and Restructuring Act which followed recommendations of a commission that studied the IRS and stated that IRS budgets "should receive stable funding for the next three years so that the leaders can . . . improve taxpayer service and compliance."

Mr. Speaker, this bill, contrary to the recommendations of a bipartisan commission and contrary to the will of this House, cuts \$465 million from the administration's request. If this Congress is serious about holding the line on spending, we would not hold our other priorities hostage to our desires of a larger pay-check.

I will be voting against this bill and I will be voting against a pay increase—I urge my colleagues to put their money where their mouth is and reject final passage of this legislation.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, the Treasury-Postal Service-General Government Appropriations Bill and repeal of the telephone excise tax, H.R. 4516. The Appropriations Committee has agreed to hire 600 ATF agents and to fund DNA ballistics technology that will assist law enforcement in arresting criminals. The conference report extends the Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative to 12 additional cities. My ENFORCE bill authorizes the same programs. The funding levels of this legislation are a victory for gun enforcement.

It is the first time gun safety and pro-gun Members have decided to give law enforcement the tools necessary to enforce existing gun laws. Now we all agree gun enforcement equals more ATF agents and funding for ballistics technology. It is particularly gratifying that the conferees dropped the language that would have prohibited local law enforcement agencies from giving a buying preference to gun manufacturers which have agreed to make safer guns and to sell only to distributors that conduct background checks.

Now, communities from Long Island to Hawaii will be able to purchase guns for their police officers that are safe and marketed through responsible dealers. This legislation contains the repeal of the Federal telephone tax. As a life-long resident of Nassau County, I know first-hand that our taxes are too high. I am grateful that the House of Representatives has recognized that the time has come to put an end to this unnecessary tax, which was originally imposed as a temporary luxury tax to help finance the Spanish-American War.

Since the telephone is a necessity I am delighted the House is acting to remove this regressive tax that disproportionately affects lower income Americans.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 209, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 476]

YEAS—212

Archer	Goss	Pease
Armey	Graham	Peterson (MN)
Bachus	Granger	Peterson (PA)
Baker	Green (WI)	Petri
Baldacci	Greenwood	Pickering
Ballenger	Gutknecht	Pitts
Barrett (NE)	Hansen	Pombo
Bartlett	Hastert	Porter
Barton	Hastings (WA)	Portman
Bass	Hayworth	Pryce (OH)
Bereuter	Hefley	Quinn
Biggart	Herger	Radanovich
Bilbray	Hill (MT)	Rahall
Bilirakis	Hilleary	Ramstad
Bliley	Hobson	Regula
Blunt	Hoekstra	Reynolds
Boehlert	Holden	Riley
Boehner	Horn	Rogers
Bonilla	Hostettler	Rohrabacher
Bono	Houghton	Ros-Lehtinen
Brady (PA)	Hulshof	Roukema
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Royce
Bryant	Hutchinson	Ryan (WI)
Burr	Hyde	Ryun (KS)
Burton	Isakson	Salmon
Buyer	Istook	Saxton
Callahan	Jenkins	Scarborough
Calvert	Johnson (CT)	Sessions
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Canady	Kasich	Shaw
Cannon	Kelly	Shays
Castle	King (NY)	Sherwood
Chambliss	Kingston	Shimkus
Coble	Knollenberg	Shuster
Collins	Kolbe	Simpson
Combest	Kuykendall	Skeen
Cooksey	LaHood	Smith (MI)
Cox	Larson	Smith (NJ)
Crane	Latham	Smith (TX)
Cubin	LaTourette	Souder
Cunningham	Leach	Spence
Davis (VA)	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Deal	Lewis (KY)	Stump
DeLay	Linder	Sununu
DeMint	LoBiondo	Sweeney
Diaz-Balart	Lucas (OK)	Talent
Dickey	Martinez	Tancredo
Dicks	Mascara	Tauzin
Doolittle	McCarthy (NY)	Taylor (NC)
Doyle	McCrery	Terry
Dreier	McHugh	Thomas
Dunn	McInnis	Thornberry
Ehlers	McKeon	Thune
Ehrlich	Metcalfe	Tiahrt
Emerson	Miller (FL)	Traficant
English	Miller, Gary	Upton
Everett	Mollohan	Vitter
Ewing	Moran (KS)	Walden
Foley	Moran (VA)	Walsh
Fossella	Morella	Wamp
Fowler	Murtha	Watkins
Frelinghuysen	Myrick	Watts (OK)
Gallegly	Nethercutt	Weldon (FL)
Gekas	Ney	Weller
Gibbons	Norwood	Whitfield
Gilchrest	Oxley	Wicker
Gillmor	Packard	Wilson
Gilman	Pascrell	Wolf
Goodlatte		Young (AK)
Goodling		Young (FL)

Abercrombie	Goode	Obey
Ackerman	Gordon	Oliver
Aderholt	Green (TX)	Ortiz
Allen	Hall (OH)	Owens
Andrews	Hall (TX)	Pallone
Baca	Hastings (FL)	Pastor
Baird	Hayes	Paul
Baldwin	Hill (IN)	Payne
Barcia	Hilliard	Pelosi
Barr	Hinchey	Phelps
Barrett (WI)	Hinojosa	Pickett
Bentsen	Hoeffel	Pomeroy
Berkley	Holt	Price (NC)
Berman	Hooley	Rangel
Berry	Hoyer	Reyes
Bishop	Inslee	Rivers
Blagojevich	Jackson (IL)	Rodriguez
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee	Roemer
Bonior	(TX)	Rogan
Borski	Jefferson	Rothman
Boswell	John	Roybal-Allard
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Boyd	Jones (NC)	Sabo
Brown (FL)	Jones (OH)	Sanchez
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Sanders
Capps	Kaptur	Sandlin
Capuano	Kennedy	Sanford
Cardin	Kildee	Sawyer
Carson	Kilpatrick	Schaffer
Chabot	Kind (WI)	Schakowsky
Chenoweth-Hage	Klecza	Scott
Clayton	Kucinich	Sensenbrenner
Clement	LaFalce	Serrano
Clyburn	Lampson	Sherman
Coburn	Lantos	Shows
Condit	Largent	Sisisky
Conyers	Lee	Skelton
Cook	Levin	Slaughter
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Coyne	Lipinski	Snyder
Cramer	Lofgren	Spratt
Crowley	Lowey	Stabenow
Cummings	Lucas (KY)	Stark
Danner	Luther	Stenholm
Davis (FL)	Maloney (CT)	Strickland
Davis (IL)	Maloney (NY)	Stupak
DeFazio	Manzullo	Tanner
DeGette	Markey	Tauscher
Delahunt	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
DeLauro	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson (CA)
Deutsch	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	McGovern	Thurman
Dixon	McIntyre	Tierney
Doggett	McKinney	Toomey
Dooley	McNulty	Towns
Duncan	Meehan	Turner
Edwards	Meek (FL)	Udall (CO)
Engel	Meeks (NY)	Udall (NM)
Etheridge	Menendez	Velazquez
Evans	Millender-	Visclosky
Farr	McDonald	Waters
Fattah	Miller, George	Watt (NC)
Filner	Minge	Waxman
Fletcher	Mink	Weiner
Ford	Moakley	Wexler
Frank (MA)	Moore	Weygand
Frost	Nadler	Woolsey
Ganske	Napolitano	Wu
Gejdenson	Neal	Wynn
Gephardt	Northup	
Gonzalez	Oberstar	

NOT VOTING—13

Becerra	Gutierrez	Vento
Campbell	Klink	Weldon (PA)
Clay	Lazio	Wise
Eshoo	McCollum	
Forbes	McIntosh	

□ 1614

Messrs. ROEMER, DELAHUNT, STENHOLM, TURNER, ROGAN and Ms. KILPATRICK and Mrs. NORTHUP changed their vote from "yea" to "nay".

Messrs. RAHALL, METCALF, MASCARA, CRANE and HILL of Montana changed their vote from "nay" to "yea".

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1615

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 654

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 654.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

RE-REFERRAL OF H.R. 4975, FRANK R. LAUTENBERG POST OFFICE AND COURTHOUSE, TO COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4975, and that H.R. 4975 be re-referred to the Committee on Government Reform.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4733, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4733) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PACKARD, ROGERS, KNOLLENBERG, FRELINGHUYSEN, CALLAHAN, LATHAM, WICKER, YOUNG of Florida, VISCLOSKY, EDWARDS, PASTOR, FORBES, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4475, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4475) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SABO

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SABO moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 4475, be instructed to insist on no less than \$43,144,000, the amount provided in the Senate amendment, for the pipeline safety program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

(Mr. SABO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to instruct conferees is very straightforward. It is a motion to help make our communities safer and cleaner by providing increased resources to protect them from the dangers of and damage from pipeline explosions, failures, and leaks.

As the conference on the differences between the House and Senate versions of the fiscal 2001 transportation appropriations bill begins, we now have an opportunity to provide these additional resources to the Office of Pipeline Safety that the Office of Pipeline Safety needs.

For fiscal year 2001, the Secretary of Transportation has requested \$47 million for pipeline safety activities, an increase of \$10 million more than last year. And while neither the House nor the Senate transportation appropriations bills provide the full increase requested, we ought to get as close to that mark as we possibly can in the final conference agreement.

This motion to instruct directs the House conferees to agree to no less than \$43 million that is included in the Senate amendment for the Office of Pipeline Safety. The Senate level would provide \$3 million more than the House level of \$40 million and \$6 million more than last year. This is the minimum amount that we should provide.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on a warm summer, predawn day on August 19 of this year, several families were sleeping at a campsite 20 miles south of Carlsbad, New Mexico. Without notice, a 30-inch diameter natural gas pipeline blasted through the earth, sprouting a 350-foot high fireball and causing a 20-foot-deep, 86-foot-long and 46-foot-wide blast crater.

This accident tragically killed a total of 12 people, including five children camped near the site of the explosion. Examination of the broken pipe determined that corrosion had eaten away one-half of the 50-year-old pipeline's wall in places.

Mr. Speaker, in order for Americans to be assured that the oil and gas pipeline industry is properly regulated and the communities have the opportunity to oversee these operations, we must fully fund the Office of Pipeline Safety. Fully funding of the Office of Pipeline Safety is a proper start to regulating an industry that has gone too far and too long without proper oversight.

The bill I have cosponsored with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), H.R. 4792, the Comprehensive Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2000, emphasizes increased pipeline inspections and public notification of where pipelines are located. It also would require stricter certification for pipeline operators and employees.

This issue is a matter of community and worker safety. We must be at the forefront of this topic by providing full funding for the Office of Pipeline Safety so that we can better protect our citizens from natural gas catastrophes.

I urge all Members to support the motion to instruct.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I stand here to say that our national oil and gas pipeline safety standards are a national disgrace. They are more like Swiss cheese than safety standards. And as a result of those wholesale failures to inspect pipelines, we had three young people die in Bellingham, Washington, and we have entire families being incinerated in New Mexico. And while these tragedies occur, indeed Congress fiddles.

For every one safety inspector in this country, we have almost 50,000 miles of pipeline. We have a wholesale failure to do these inspections. And this will take one step forward to increase probably 30 inspectors so we can move on with these inspections.

Let me say that giving resources to the Office of Pipeline Safety is not enough. It is not simply a matter of resources. It is a matter of will and statute. We have wholesale failure of having an adequate statute, as well.

We are calling upon this House in this Congress to adopt meaningful, aggressive, comprehensive revisions of our oil and gas pipeline standards. We have several bills pending in the House. We are calling for the leaders of the House of both parties in this Chamber to adopt a comprehensive inspection standard.

Let me advise the House there is a bill that has come from the other Chamber. It is woefully inadequate. It does not require inspections by statute. It again goes down that rose-colored path of giving discretion to the Office of Pipeline Safety. That is the path of

failure. We have to adopt a standard that cannot give any wiggle room to the industry or to the bureaucrats.

Let us pass a strong comprehensive bill this year out of this Chamber. America deserves no less.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I accept the instruction and pledge to work with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and our staff with his staff to get this number to the highest possible that we can. So, publicly, I think it is a good instruction. Let us just not do an instruction and walk away and nothing ever happen. Let us get the number up.

So I will work with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), and I completely agree and we accept.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his generous comments. My friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), has always been someone highly committed to safety in the various transportation modes, and I congratulate him for his continued effort.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

Messrs. WOLF, DELAY, REGULA, ROGERS, PACKARD, CALLAHAN, TIAHRT, ADERHOLT, Ms. GRANGER, and Messrs. YOUNG of Florida, SABO, OLVER, PASTOR, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Messrs. SERRANO, FORBES, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

□ 1630

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3244, TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION ACT OF 2000

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3244) to combat trafficking of persons, especially into the sex trade, slavery, and slavery-like conditions, in the United States and countries around the world through prevention, through prosecution and enforcement against traffickers, and through protection and assistance to victims of trafficking, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. WATT OF
NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WATT of North Carolina moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3244 be instructed to recede to the Senate on provisions contained in section 7 of the Senate amendment (relating to obtaining visas for victims of trafficking without numerical limitation) in order to ensure that any victim of trafficking in the United States who has been forced, coerced, or defrauded into sexual slavery, involuntary servitude, or other relevant conditions and who has escaped such bondage may obtain a visa and remain in the United States and to encourage such victims to assist United States law enforcement authorities to break up trafficking rings and end the terrible practice of trafficking in human beings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am offering this motion to instruct conferees at the request of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), who may show up here at any moment and participate in this discussion, but in the interim I am trying to carry his water for him.

Of all the human rights violations currently occurring in our world, the trafficking of human beings, predominately women and children, has to be one of the most horrific practices of our time. At its core, the international trade in women and children is about abduction, coercion, violence and exploitation in the most reprehensible ways. H.R. 3244 is a modest effort to eradicate forcible and/or fraudulent trafficking of persons into prostitution or involuntary servitude.

Among other things, the bill increases penalties and provides some protection for victims who would otherwise be deportable if identified by law enforcement, by creating a new "T" visa category for eligible victims. Unfortunately, the bill reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary and approved by the House is much more restrictive than the bill originally introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON). Instead, a much narrower bill was substituted by the Committee on the Judiciary markup to satisfy unrealistic concerns that the bill would somehow enable persons to fraudulently obtain a lawful status by claiming that they were a victim of sex trafficking or involuntary servitude.

Most significantly, the bill unnecessarily caps at 5,000 per year the number of victims who can receive a non-immigrant visa and caps at 5,000 per year the number of victims who can become permanent residents.

Because estimates of the number of trafficking victims entering the United States are greater than 5,000 per year, I see no reason not to provide protection to the 5,001 and the 5,025 victim who have been the subject of such terrible acts. As a result, my motion to instruct instructs the conferees to recede to the Senate provision which contains no such cap.

We have no arbitrary limit on the number of refugees who can enter this country. We have no arbitrary limit on the number of asylees who can enter this country and, in my judgment, it is beneath our dignity as a nation to use an arbitrary cap to shut our doors to victims of slavery and sex trafficking.

The Members should know that this motion is supported by the Catholic Conference, the National Organization for Women, Legal Defense and Educational Fund and the National Immigration Law Center. I urge the Members to support this common sense and compassionate motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct, and I would like to briefly address the motion. I need to point out to the Members that the bill that passed the House was a carefully crafted compromise that took into account all the input that we had received in the committee process on this legislation. It is my understanding that of all the estimates that have been made concerning the number of potential beneficiaries under this legislation, who would be eligible to obtain visas, none of those estimates have exceeded the 5,000 cap.

The original estimates were substantially below the 5,000 cap that is included in the bill, so I believe that it is unlikely, extremely unlikely, that this cap would have any practical impact. The cap is there, however, to make certain that this bill does not result in admissions that are beyond what was anticipated when the legislation was considered.

The chairman of the subcommittee of jurisdiction, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), is on his way to further discuss the motion to instruct and to express his opposition so I would just make that general observation that I have made.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly object to the 5,000 per year cap on trafficking of victim visas imposed by the majority. The majority

has not been able to cite a single bit of evidence in the hearing or in the markup to support a cap of 5,000. We understand from the prior speaker that there is opinion that this may be sufficient, and if that is the case there is certainly no harm in not having an arbitrary cap. If it is less than 5,000, then there will be no issue but if, if, one year there is more than 5,000 we would find this cap to be morally wrong.

It is an unfortunate fact of life that we can never predict how many people will be the victim of trafficking and how serious their plight will be; how many of them will seek refuge in our wonderful country, a bastion of freedom. Congress has granted similar discretion to increase refugee caps and there are no caps for asylum candidates. So it is my view that we have room in this vast, wonderful, prosperous country for victims of sex trafficking and slavery, and I do not want to be an American who says to the 5,001 victim, they are out of luck.

In fact, the evidence is that the cap of 5,000, in fact, may be too low. There was recently an exhaustive report by the Central Intelligence Agency titled, the International Trafficking in Women to the United States, a Contemporary Manifestation of Slavery. That is the name of the report. It outlines women who are brought to the United States to work as prostitutes who are abused as laborers or servants, and even if this report overestimates the number of trafficking victims by a large factor, the limit of 5,000 would still be too low and it would deny thousands of victims of trafficking any right to remain in this country.

So I think we ought to put this into context. We have already in this country women who have been brought here and really held in virtual slavery, sometimes as victims of sexual oppression. When those women break free, we want to make sure that they have found refuge in this country of freedom. We do not want to then turn them away back to their abusers.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to lift up their hearts, remember that America stands for freedom, to understand that we have room for the 5,001 victim of slavery who is held here and seeks freedom and to support the motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the Chair of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control the remainder of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY),

for yielding me his time and for speaking in opposition to this motion. I, too, oppose this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this motion to strike the cap on the number of visas and green cards given to trafficking victims. The bipartisan authors of this bill gave us this number of 5,000 when estimating the size of the victim group. In fact, at one point, the estimated size of victims was 1,500, so 5,000 is a very, very generous level.

We ought to stand by their estimate and respect the desires of the bipartisan authors of this bill. Also, Mr. Speaker, imposing a cap obviously safeguards against fraud. Rather than having an unlimited number of visas available that might be taken advantage of by individuals wanting to get into the system, we need to have that cap to avoid people being tempted to take advantage of the system and abuse the privilege.

This bill is a merging of both Republican and Democratic trafficking bills. The authors of this bill estimated the number of trafficking victims in the United States to be no more than 5,000. Both Democrats and Republicans agreed on this cap at the Committee on the Judiciary because it was the number given to us by the authors of the bill. Now some want to eliminate the cap altogether.

Whenever a new form of immigration relief is created, many aliens apply for that relief. Too often, those applications do not contain bona fide claims of relief. We need tools to prevent this form of relief from being abused and jeopardizing relief for valid and legitimate claimants. One of those tools is a cap.

When a group of people needs protections or relief from deportation, it is important to know the size of that group to understand the size of the problem. If the group size is known or estimated, no harm is done in creating a cap that correlates to that group's size. The size of trafficking victims has been estimated. The authors of the bill have told us the group size is 5,000 people so no harm comes from imposing a cap of 5,000 and, in fact, much good comes from having a cap to stop the fraud and abuse.

This cap will prevent large numbers of aliens from falsely claiming to be trafficking victims. It safeguards against fraud, which everyone should be concerned about.

Finally, the caps in this bill are on the victims only. They are not on the victims' family members. So spouses, sons and daughters, children of the victim and even parents of the victim, if the victim is under 21, may all receive a visa and a green card free from this cap.

□ 1645

The same is true for the green cards themselves. The green card cap of 5,000 is again just for the victims only. It is not on the victims' family members, so obviously many more than 5,000 indi-

viduals will be admitted and be able to avail themselves of this new category. There is no reason to remove this cap, and I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose it.

The bipartisan authors of the bill, I want to repeat again, gave us the number of 5,000 because they thought that was more than adequate to satisfy the needs of all legitimate victims, and we should stand by that number. Having a cap in place prevents fraud, and I urge all of those who are concerned about fraud, as we seen so often in our immigration system, to oppose this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleague from Texas (Mr. SMITH) would have us believe that this is about fraud. It is not. Regardless of how many people come in having been imported into our country as slaves or as sex objects, there still has to be an application to stay, and that application has to be evaluated, so the fraud is taken out in that context.

It may be that if the gentleman is worried about fraud, it would be 4,000 in the first 5,000 who have engaged in some fraudulent activity. That is not the issue here. The issue is would we send a woman or child who has been sexually abused and put into slavery in this country back into another country where that kind of activity was going on, so whether the victim is the 499th or the 4,099th, or the 515th or the 5,015th should not be the issue. The issue is what should our policy be, and we should open our arms to these people.

Mr. Speaker, I keep hearing these estimates and the statement that there was some bipartisan agreement. Let me be clear that there was no bipartisan agreement about this number. The bill came out of the committee, but there was substantial disagreement. There was an effort to revise the number in the committee, and I am looking at a report here from the Central Intelligence Agency briefing in April of 1999 that estimated that the number of women and children who are trafficked annually into the United States primarily by small crime rings and loosely connected criminal networks is between 45,000 and 50,000.

Now, the estimate, the guess, about how many of those people will come forward and present themselves is no more than conjecture. One-tenth of them might come forward, in which case we would have a number between 4,500 and 5,000; but if 20 percent of them came forward, you would have a number at 10,000, and would it be in our own conscience as a Nation to deprive that extra 5,000 or that extra 100 by some arbitrary cap that really is just an arbitrary figure?

Our policy is to welcome people in, who have been abused, into other countries, and that should continue to be our policy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) for yielding me the time.

This is a human rights issue of great moment to me. One of the worst practices that has come to the Congress' attention is this trafficking of women and children and the coercion and exploitation and violence that accompanies it.

We are disappointed that the bill introduced formally by our colleagues the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) has been narrowed in the Committee on the Judiciary, and we have put caps at 5,000 per year on the number of victims.

As the gentleman from North Carolina has pointed out, this is arbitrary and beneath our dignity as a Nation. I am happy to say that many of the immigration and human rights organizations support us, and so I urge that this motion to instruct be given very careful attention by our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I think the cap is arbitrary and does frankly a good disservice to our international image as a country concerned with human rights.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my friend from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), because I know him well enough to know that he would never intentionally mislead anyone, but I would like to clarify a figure that he used, 45,000, and emphasize that is a worldwide figure of possible victims. That is not the number expected, I understand, to come to the United States.

I would repeat the point that the authors of the bill who represented Republicans and Democrats are very comfortable with this cap of 5,000. It does guard against fraud. In fact, going back to the cap, we think it is more than generous, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion, one, because we need to prevent fraud; and, two, because the bipartisan authors of the bill are happy with that cap.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on the point that my colleague from Texas (Mr. SMITH) has raised. I am reading a report from the Center for the Study of Intelligence, and I am reading verbatim from that report. It says, and I quote: "An estimated 45,000 to 50,000 women and children are trafficked annually to the United States." Now, that might be worldwide being trafficked into the United States, but that is what this bill is about.

How many of them are we going to allow? How many are going to come

forward and seek to stay here once they have been trafficked in? If the figure is wrong, it is because the report is wrong; it is not because I have misstated the record. I am stating it in good conscience. I cannot verify it. I was reading from a report. Maybe the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) will have some clarification.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to ask the gentleman his judgment. It is my understanding from law enforcement that the ability to actually prosecute these traffickers and to put an end and decrease the number of people who are brought in and abused is really very much dependent on the ability of these women to escape and to understand that they will be given refuge; and if you cannot escape and be given refuge, then you really cannot cooperate with the police, and we will never be successful in eliminating and prosecuting and ending this trafficking in human beings as sex slaves.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from North Carolina if that is his understanding as well.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Reclaiming my time, I think the gentlewoman from California makes an exceptionally good point that in addition to the human rights argument, there are actually public safety and criminal law administrative reasons that we should not have this cap, because we want to have in place an incentive for these women and children to be able to come forward and break out of this sex ring and slave ring and come forward. The primary incentive they have is to seek to be able to stay in the United States, and if they cannot do that, then we provide no protection to them as a Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) for yielding the 3 minutes to me.

Let me thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for this motion to instruct and the leadership of the Members on this floor. I hope that our colleagues are listening to us. The gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) and myself offered an amendment, or legislation, dealing with battered immigrant women, which is not a directly pointed point, but it does deal with the abuse of women.

So we know that overall in these issues dealing with sexual abuse or physical abuse, it is most necessary to have some kind of relief. The capping that is going on with respect to the victims of trafficking is egregious, and it is important that we should not cap the numbers to avoid helping people. What happens is with this motion, it answers the need, because it eliminates

the arbitrary 5,000 annual cap so we can provide these as to all victims who have been forced into involuntary servitude and sexual trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, needless to say, we can document today with stories that recount for us that sexual trafficking or trafficking of human beings for sexual activities continues today. When we traveled to Southeast Asia and Bangladesh and India and Pakistan, there were women there who told us they were victims of it.

It has happened to us, there were children who were able to relay the story of what happens, and sometimes these people are able to make their way to a refuge in the United States, and that is why the Catholic Conference, the National Organization for Women Legal Defense and Education Fund, and The National Immigration Law Center see the merit in this motion to instruct, that the cap is dangerous, the cap is devastating, and in some sense, Mr. Speaker, it is inhuman.

It is extremely important that we begin to look at this problem as a real-life, 21st century problem; and the act itself combats trafficking with a three-tier approach. It has prevention, prosecution, and enforcement against the traffickers, but we must find a way to protect the victims.

This motion to instruct says the victims are important. The capping is wrong. Let us remove the arbitrary cap. Let us make sure that we provide visas to all of those in need. This is reasonable, Mr. Speaker. It addresses the current problem. I hope my colleagues will see the good sense of it, and that they will vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, trafficking in human beings is a form of modern-day slavery. At its core, the international trade in women and children is about abduction, coercion, violence, and exploitation in the most reprehensible ways.

Trafficking victims suffer extreme physical and mental abuses, including rape, torture, starvation, imprisonment, death threats, and physical brutality. Women and children trafficked into the sex industry and exposed to deadly diseases, including HIV and AIDS. Victims trafficked into domestic servitude, bonded sweatshop labor and other industries are subject to violence and sometimes literally worked to death.

The Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 1999 combats trafficking with a three-tier approach. It provides for prevention, prosecution and enforcement against the traffickers, and assistance to the victims of trafficking. We can and should provide assistance to the victims of trafficking.

However, the bill unnecessarily caps at 5,000 per year the number of victims who can receive a nonimmigrant visa and caps at 5,000 per year the number of victims which can become permanent residents.

This is unfortunate because estimates of victims entering the United States are greater than 5,000, and we should not cut off protection.

This Motion To Instruct is supported by the Catholic Conference and the National Organization for Women Legal Conference and the

National Organization for Women's Legal Defense And Education Fund. I urge Members to support this Motion to Instruct.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Members will remember to vote against this motion because it will prevent fraud, and the cap has been agreed to by the authors.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. GILMAN, GOODLING, SMITH of New Jersey, HYDE, SMITH of Texas, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut; and Messrs. GEJDENSON, LANTOS, CONYERS, and CARDIN.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO ATTEND THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE HONORABLE HERBERT H. BATEMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 573, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the committee to attend the funeral of the late Herbert H. Bateman:

Mr. BLILEY, Virginia;
Mr. HASTERT, Illinois;
Mr. ARMEY, Texas;
Mr. BONIOR, Michigan;
Mr. WOLF, Virginia;
Mr. BOUCHER, Virginia;
Mr. SISISKY, Virginia;
Mr. PICKETT, Virginia;
Mr. MORAN, Virginia;
Mr. GOODLATTE, Virginia;
Mr. SCOTT, Virginia;
Mr. DAVIS, Virginia;
Mr. GOODE, Virginia;
Mr. SPENCE, South Carolina;
Mr. SHUSTER, Pennsylvania;
Mr. SKELTON, Missouri;
Mr. STUMP, Arizona;
Mr. BEREUTER, Nebraska;
Mr. HUNTER, California;
Mr. SKEEN, New Mexico;
Mr. BILIRAKIS, Florida;
Mr. BURTON, Indiana;
Mr. ORTIZ, Texas;
Mr. PACKARD, California;
Mr. HOUGHTON, New York;
Mrs. MORELLA, Maryland;
Mr. GOSS, Florida;
Mr. MCNULTY, New York;
Mr. TANNER, Tennessee;
Mr. BARTLETT, Maryland;
Mr. BUYER, Indiana;

Mrs. FOWLER, Florida;
Mr. MCKEON, California;
Mr. EHLERS, Michigan;
Mr. HOSTETTLER, Indiana;
Mr. LAHOOD, Illinois;
Mr. LATHAM, Iowa;
Mr. GIBBONS, Nevada;
Mr. RILEY, Alabama; and
Mr. SHERWOOD, Pennsylvania.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has completed its legislative business for the week. There will be no votes in the House tomorrow in honor of our late friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, Herb Bateman.

The House will next meet on Monday, September 18 at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 o'clock p.m. for legislative business. We will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices tomorrow.

On Monday, no recorded votes are expected before 6 o'clock p.m.

On Tuesday, September 19 and the balance of the week, the House will consider the following measures:

The Debt Relief Lockbox Reconciliation Act for FY 2001;

H.R. 2909, the Inter-country Adoption Act;

H.R. 4205, the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 Conference Report; and

H.R. 3244, the Trafficking Victims Protection Act Conference Report.

Mr. Speaker, we also expect that appropriators will be working hard to complete conference reports for consideration in the House next week.

□ 1700

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

EIGHTH BIENNIAL REPORT OF INTERAGENCY ARCTIC RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Science:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 108(b) of Public Law 98-373 (15 U.S.C. 4107(b)), I transmit herewith the Eighth Biennial Report of the Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee (February 1, 1998, to January 31, 2000).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 14, 2000.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
SEPTEMBER 18, 2000

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday, September 18, 2000, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. RADANOVICH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AMERICA'S NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue that is not getting the attention I feel it deserves in the current national debate between the major presidential candidates and Members from both parties running for Congress, the House and the Senate, and that is the issue of America's national security.

I want to start, Mr. Speaker, by focusing on the speech that President Clinton gave at Georgetown University just 2 weeks ago on the issue of national missile defense. The President gave the speech because when he signed my national missile defense bill into

law over 1 year ago, the President said that he would sign into law, agree to move forward, on national defense, but then make a decision to go forward at some point in time in the future.

Mr. Speaker, let me go back and restate for our colleagues the facts in this area, the actions by the President, and then go through the President's speech in detail and attempt to give what I would consider to be our response to the President's speech.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago the CIA produced an intelligence estimate that told the Congress and the American people we would not expect to see a threat emerge that could hurt the U.S. directly from a long-range missile for at least 15 years.

Many of us on both sides of the aisle felt that that estimate was incorrect. In fact when we pressed the CIA, and I was the one who got the first classified briefing on that report because I was one of the requesters of it, the CIA eventually changed its mind and came to a conclusion that we all agreed to with Donald Rumsfeld and the Rumsfeld Commission that in fact the threat was not 15 years away, but that in fact the threat was here today and growing dynamically with every passing day. That major change caused a bipartisan group in the Congress to want to prod this administration to move forward in defending America, its people, and its troops.

Some would say, why would you want to do that? There has never been an attack on America. No country is going to attack us because we have such tremendous clout, we could wipe them out, and if they really want to harm us, they would use a truck bomb or use a car bomb or an explosive device.

Mr. Speaker, the facts just do not support that contention. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in 1991, 28 young Americans came home in body bags from Saudi Arabia because our country let those young men and women down. Twenty-eight young Americans came home in body bags because we could not defend against a low complexity scud missile. The scud missile was launched into our military barracks in Saudi Arabia, just as Saddam had launched missile after missile into Israel, raining terror on the Israeli families who were injured and killed by those attacks.

Mr. Speaker, that attack by Saddam on our soldiers, and they were both young women and young men, they were young wives and young fathers, because they were largely from reserve units, half of them from my State, showed the vulnerability of America to the emerging threat that missiles provide.

In 1991, this Congress vowed that that would never happen again, that we as Republicans and Democrats would never allow America's sons and daughters to be wiped out by a terrorist like Saddam or a Nation like Iran or North Korea that would use missiles to kill our people. So, as a result, Mr. Speaker, we began to work the process in the

Congress to change the minds of Bill Clinton and AL GORE in terms of missile defense.

Now, let me state for the record, Mr. Speaker, that President Clinton and Vice President GORE categorically opposed missile defense through the first 7 years of their administration. Now, the President and the Vice President can spin this any way they want, but the facts are that for 7 years they opposed missile defense. They opposed the Congress when we said the threat was emerging. They opposed the Congress when Democrats and Republicans put more money into missile defense systems. They opposed the Congress when we said that the ABM treaty was not flexible enough to allow us to defend our homeland and our people. For 7 years, President Clinton and Vice President GORE said we do not have to worry about missile defense, we rely on arms control agreements.

Let me say this, Mr. Speaker. I am not against arms control agreements. In fact, I support most of the arms control agreements that America is a party to. But there is an interesting point about arms control, Mr. Speaker, and that is that if you do not enforce those agreements, if you do not abide by the requirements to penalize those entities that violate those agreements, they mean nothing, they are worthless pieces of paper.

That has been the record of this administration. Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, I did a speech on the House floor. I documented in that speech 37 violations of arms control agreements by China and Russia. Thirty-seven times we caught Russia and China sending technology away from their country, which is illegal under the arms control agreements that we are party to with those nations.

Where did they send that technology? They sent it to a few countries: Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, North Korea, Pakistan and India. Thirty-seven times we caught the Russians and the Chinese sending technology abroad. That is a violation of arms control agreements, and 37 times we should have imposed sanctions on those countries and on those companies in those countries that we caught violating those arms control acts.

Out of those 37 times that we caught the Russians and the Chinese transferring arms, we opposed the required sanctions two times; once when we caught the Chinese transferring M-11 missiles to Pakistan, and the second time when we caught the Chinese transferring ring magnets to Pakistan for the nuclear program. The other 35 times we pretended the transfers never occurred. We denied that we had evidence.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is so bad that in one case I was in Moscow January of 1996, one month after the Washington Post reported that we had caught, actually with the help of our allies in that area, we had caught the Russians transferring guidance systems to Iraq.

What are these guidance systems used for? They are used to make those missiles that killed our young people more accurate. They are used to make the missiles that killed Jews in Israel more accurate. The Washington Post said that we had caught the Russians giving this technology to Iraq, on the front page of their newspaper.

So I was in Moscow, and I was in the office of Ambassador Tom Pickering, who is currently the third ranking leader in our State Department. I said, "Ambassador Pickering, what was the Russian response when you asked them about the fact that we caught them transferring these devices to Iraq, which is a violation of the missile technology control regime, an arms control agreement?"

He said, "Congressman WELDON, I didn't ask the Russians yet."

I said, "Mr. Ambassador, why wouldn't you ask the Russians? The Washington Post reported it on the front page. They said it happened back in June. Why would we not demand the Russians stop this process and demand action on the part of sanctioning those Russian companies?"

He said, "That effort has got to come from the White House. It has got to come from Washington. I can't take that action as the ambassador here."

So I came back to Washington and wrote to President Clinton a letter in January of that year, which he responded to in March of that year, and in that letter he said, "Dear Congressman WELDON, I agree with you. We are very concerned that Russia may have transferred technology to Iraq that could harm Israel and could harm America, and if we find that that took place, we will impose the required sanctions under the treaty, we will take aggressive action. But, Congressman WELDON, we have no evidence."

Mr. Speaker, over in my office at 2452 Rayburn, I have two devices. I have an accelerometer and a gyroscope, the heart of Soviet guidance systems that were taken off of Soviet missiles that we caught being transferred to Iraq, not once, not twice, but three times. Every time I travel around the country, and I have spoken to 10 or 15 AIPAC meetings, I have spoken to hundreds of defense organizations, I take my guidance systems.

I cannot tell you where I got them, but I can tell you it was through one of our agencies in this country. And I hold them up, and I say, "Mr. President, here is the evidence that you said we didn't have." In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have over 100 sets of those guidance systems that we captured that were being transferred from Russia to Iraq on those three occasions, and we expect that Russia probably transferred hundreds of other systems to Iraq for the same purpose.

The point is this, Mr. Speaker: If we do not enforce arms control agreements, the arms control agreements mean nothing. This administration has the worst record in the history of arms

control agreements in lack of enforcement.

How about a second situation? The President of Israel at the time, Mr. Netanyahu, came out publicly and said Israel had evidence that Russia was cooperating with Iran in building a new missile system that could directly hit Israel from anyplace in Iran called the Shahab-3 and Shahab-4. Israel came out with this publicly. It was a sensational story. All the Jews in America were upset, all Americans were upset, because here was a respected ally of America saying publicly that they had evidence that there were violations of arms control agreements by Russia giving technology to Iran that could threaten our friends and threaten Americans.

Well, the Congress was livid. Democrats and Republicans joined together. In fact, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) joined with Democrats in a bipartisan bill called the Iran missile sanctions bill. That bill was designed to force the administration to impose sanctions on Russia. That is required by the treaty.

But the Congress was so incensed that Democrats and Republicans said they do not get it, we are going to force them. Two hundred fifty Members of Congress in a bipartisan manner endorsed the Iran missile sanctions bill.

The bill was scheduled for a vote on the House floor. Three days before the bill was scheduled for a vote, my office got a call from the White House. We do not get many calls from the White House, Mr. Speaker, for obvious reasons. In this case it was Vice President GORE calling me to invite me to come to the Old Executive Office Building so that he could convince me that the bill was a bad idea.

Well, I respect the Vice President, so I said, sure, I will come down. So I traveled down to the Old Executive Office Building and went into a room where there were Members of the House and Senate from both parties sitting around a table. Let me see now, if memory is corrected, CARL LEVIN was there, JOHN MCCAIN was there, BOB KERRY was there, Lee Hamilton was there, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) was there, Jane Harman was there, JOHN KYL was there.

□ 1715

About 14 Democrats and Republicans from the House and the Senate with Vice President GORE and Leon Fuerth, his National Security Adviser. For one hour, they lobbied us not to support the Iran missile sanctions bill. They said, if you bring this bill up on the floor of the House and if you pass it, it will undermine our relationship with Russia and Boris Yeltsin. When the Vice President finished, we said, Mr. Vice President, with all due respect, and we do respect you as a person, there is no longer a confidence in the Congress that you are enforcing arms control agreements and stopping proliferation.

Two days later, in spite of that personal lobbying by Vice President GORE and personal lobbying by President Clinton, this House passed the Iran missile sanctions bill with not just Republican votes. Mr. Speaker, 396 Members of Congress, 396 Members of Congress out of 435 voted to slap the President across the face because he was not enforcing the very arms control agreement he talks about so frequently.

We broke for the Christmas and religious holidays and came back in February of the next year. The Senate was going to take up the same bill, the Iran missile sanctions bill.

I get another call in my office, an unusual call, again from the White House inviting me back to the Old Executive Office Building. So I again went down. The same people were there, the same leaders of the House and the Senate from both parties. We sat around the table. Again, it was Vice President GORE, it was Leon Fuerth, and this time, a member of the National Security Council, Jack Caravelli. For 1 hour and 30 minutes they lobbied us against the Iran missile sanctions bill. They said, you cannot pass this in the Senate. You have passed it in the House; it is embarrassing to us. If you pass it in the Senate, it will cause further harm to our relationship with Russia.

When the Vice President finished, we said, Mr. Vice President, you do not get it. You have not stopped the proliferation. You are not enforcing the arms control agreements. The technology is still going to our enemies, and you are sitting on your hands. We do not want to cause conflict with Russia, but you have armed control agreements to stop proliferation, and if you are not going to enforce them, then these agreements are worthless pieces of paper.

With that, we left the Vice President's office. A week later the Senate voted the bill. Again, Mr. Speaker, the vote was 96 to 4. Mr. Speaker, 94 senators to 4, slapping the President and the Vice President across the face, because they did not get it. Arms control agreements are no good unless we enforce them, and an administration that basis its strategic relationships on arms control, but does not enforce those agreements, has no international security ability, and has no foreign policy. We passed that bill overwhelmingly, and the President had the audacity to veto it.

Mr. Speaker, we could not override the veto that year, there was not enough time, so we came back in this session of Congress; and we passed the bill again in the House and in the Senate. And guess what the President did this time, Mr. Speaker, because he does this so well? He must have went like this, let us see, which way is the wind blowing today. Oh, the polls are showing that I better sign this, or I am going to be embarrassed and they are going to override my veto. So the President signed our Iran missile sanctions bill into law, after opposing it,

after lobbying us and saying that we did not need it.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we have a problem. That is why we have nations that are now threatening Israel and our friends in the Middle East that we cannot defend against. Because this administration has allowed the technology to flow like running water down a riverbed. This administration, while not enforcing arms control agreements, has opposed us every step of the way on missile defense.

Now, the President gave us a great speech at Georgetown. He bit his lip, he tweaked his eye and did all of those things that make him so appealing on national television. But he did not tell the truth, Mr. Speaker; and that is the most important thing. He said, we are for missile defense.

Let us look at the facts, Mr. Speaker. Four years ago the President went before the AIPAC national convention. AIPAC is the group that represents the Jews in America who are concerned about issues affecting Israel's security. President Clinton stood on the podium in front of 2,000 Jews at an AIPAC convention, and he pounded his fist on the dais and he said this: I will never let the Jews in Israel feel like they are unprotected from the missiles that Iran and Iraq are now acquiring. I will support the Arrow program that Israel is trying to build.

Well, let us look at the facts, Mr. Speaker. That same year, the administration had requested no dollars for the Arrow program, which comes under my subcommittee. In fact, Mr. Speaker, because I formed a relationship with the Israelis and with the Israeli Knesset on a cooperative bilateral protection capability, we went to the Israelis and to AIPAC and said, how much money should we put in the defense budget for AIPAC? The number for the Arrow program that year did not come from the White House, it did not come from the Pentagon, it came from an inquiry that I made to AIPAC; yet the President said he was supporting the protection of the people in Israel. He also said he was supporting a program called THEL, Theater High Energy Laser, one of the most promising technologies to take out missiles like those being developed by the Iranians and the Iraqis. What the President did not tell the folks at AIPAC that year was that he had zeroed out funding for the THEL program for 3 straight years.

Mr. Speaker, one cannot continue to say one thing and do something else. When the President talked about delaying the deployment of missile defense at Georgetown last week, he failed to mention a few things. He said he was supported. Well, let us look at the facts, Mr. Speaker. I was very careful over the past 6 years in building a case for missile defense to base our case on facts, not rhetoric. I did not agree with the approach that was taken under the Reagan years, when I was not here, of a massive umbrella

that would protect all America. I did not think it could work. That is not what we proposed. We proposed a system that would provide a thin layer of protection against those rogue threats that we know are there today, and that was our basis. We had over 150 classified and public briefings and hearings for our colleagues in this Chamber to learn the facts about the growing threats, to learn the facts about the technology, to learn the facts about what our allies would say.

After all of those briefings and all of those hearings, Mr. Speaker, I worked with my colleagues on the other side to put into place a bipartisan bill. In fact, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) was my cosponsor. That bill had bipartisan support. It simply said, we will deploy a missile defense system. Simple phrasing. One sentence. It is the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense system. The bill was scheduled for a vote a year ago in March. On the day the bill was coming up for a vote, President Clinton sent a letter, along with AL GORE, to every Member of this body, 435 Members. And the President said this: I oppose CURT WELDON's bill on missile defense. I urge you, Democrats and Republicans, to vote no on H.R. 4.

I knew the President was against missile defense all along. I knew AL GORE was against missile defense all along, so it did not surprise me. In fact, it was exactly what I wanted.

So we convened that day. I had already gone to Moscow with Don Rumsfeld and Jim Woolsey, who was Bill Clinton's CIA director. We had already briefed the Russians on what we were doing; we had already closed the House down for 2 hours and had a classified briefing on this floor where NINE members of the Rumsfeld Commission presented factual information. Mr. Speaker, 250 Members of Congress sat in these chairs with no staff here and heard the briefing that outlined the fact that the threat is here today to America and that we better do something about it. All of that took place.

On the day of the vote, I said this to my colleagues: it is a clear choice today, folks. If you support President Clinton and AL GORE, then vote against my bill. Oppose it. I will respect you, because I will respect you for your convictions of thinking we do not need this system. So vote against it, and we will still be friends. But if you agree with me, if you agree with the CIA and the revised threat assessment; if you agree with Donald Rumsfeld and Jim Woolsey, if you agree with those people who say the threat is here today, then vote for my bill, and vote against the President.

Mr. Speaker, we had a lot of debate that day. When the vote came, the President lost. Mr. Speaker, 103 Democrats voted with me, 102 Democrats voted with Bill Clinton and AL GORE, and all but two Republicans voted with me. The vote was veto-proof; it was

overwhelming. Mr. Speaker, 317 Members of Congress said once again to Bill Clinton, you just do not get it, President Clinton. We are going to force you to do something that you have been opposed to. The Senate passed a similar bill with 98 votes.

So guess what the President did, Mr. Speaker? He did what he did on the Iran missile sanctions bill. He read the polls. Well, the Congress is overwhelmingly in favor, and the American people say do it. I better find a way to support that bill, sign it into law, but to politically leave myself an out so I can get out from under this right before the election next year, and that is when he did. He signed the bill into law and unlike Bill Clinton, there was no Rose Garden signing ceremony; and if you know this White House, they do that more than we eat meals. There was no Rose Garden event where people came down and stood behind the President. Very quietly, with no one around, the President signed the bill into law, H.R. 4, because he knew he could not oppose it. We would overwhelmingly override his veto.

So the President said when he signed the bill into law, I will make my decision next year about whether or not we should deploy a system. He said, I am going to make it based on some factors, whether or not the threat is real, what our allied response is, and whether or not it is cost justified, and whether or not the technology is there. And that was the basis of his speech at Georgetown.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me analyze some of the facts in that speech. First of all, Mr. Speaker, the President himself acknowledged in his speech, the threat is here. He said, for the first time, the threat to America is here and it is growing. In 7 years and 10 months, or 8 months of Clinton-Gore administration, never once did they admit that the threat was here and growing. In the Georgetown speech 2 weeks ago, President Clinton acknowledged what we have said for 7 years: the threat is real and it is growing.

The second issue the President raised was, but I am not sure that technology is ready. We need more testing. Now, that was a great statement by the President: we need more testing. For 6 years, Mr. Speaker, this body has been plussing up funds for more testing of missile defense systems each year; in fact, has spent \$1 billion each year more than what the President asked for. Now, you know what the President and Vice President did each year? They criticized the Congress when we put more money in for testing. Yet, in the Georgetown speech, the President said, we need more testing.

Now, he cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. He cannot go to Georgetown and say I am for missile defense, I want more testing, even though for the past 6 years, I have opposed the funding for more testing. The President said, the technology is not ready yet. Well, Mr. Speaker, we all know

that it is going to take 5 years before we can put a system into place that will meet the challenges of the threats that we see emerging.

Mr. Speaker, the President said, and I quote: "The technology is not ready." Now, that was an absolute distortion. Either he was misinformed, or he lied. Now, why do I say that? Because, Mr. Speaker, over the summer we held hearings in my committee on the Committee on Armed Services where we had the President's experts on missile defense testify. Jack Gansler is one of the highest ranking officials in the President's Defense Department at the Pentagon. He is in charge of acquisition and technology, I think number three in the Pentagon.

□ 1730

Jack Gansler said in questioning in our committee, and I will provide a copy of it for the RECORD, that when I asked him, "Is the technology to hit to kill a missile with a missile or a bullet with a bullet, is that technology achievable," his answer was, "In my opinion, the technology is here. We have achieved the technology."

General Kadish is a three-star general, a very capable leader. He is paid to represent our military in running the program. He is not Democrat, he is not a Republican, he is a paid military expert. He is respected by leaders in both parties.

General Kadish testified before our committee. We asked him, "General, is the technology achievable to do this? Can we hit a bullet with a bullet?" General Kadish said, "In my opinion, the technology is here. We have done it. It is no longer a technology problem, it is an engineering challenge to put the systems together."

The Welsh report. General Welsh is a retired Air Force general that the Clinton administration hired to survey our progress on missile defense. The Welsh report said unequivocally that the technology is here.

So we had Jack Gansler, General Kadish, and General Welsh in the Welsh report all saying publicly, there is not a technology problem. What does President Clinton say at Georgetown? "We have a technology problem." Either President Clinton does not listen well, he does not pay attention, or else he lies well, because his three top experts on this issue totally refuted what he said to the American people when he said that the technology was not at hand.

Now, there are challenges. There are engineering challenges. There are challenges to sort out decoys from the real bomb that may be coming in. But those challenges are achievable. In fact, the head scientist for the National Missile Defense Program, Dr. Peller, when he testified before our committee, I asked him, I said, "Dr. Peller, how hard is it to build a system that can shoot down a missile with another missile?"

He said, "Congressman, when I worked at Boeing, before I ran this program I ran their Space Station program. The challenge to build a Space

Station is much harder and greater than the challenge I face on national missile defense."

So all of the experts, Mr. Speaker, refute the comments the President made at Georgetown, yet the President got away with this grand national speech. He also said, "I am making a decision to delay deployment today because I want to do more testing. I want to make sure it will work." The irony is, Mr. Speaker, the only thing that he did by delaying the decision with the Georgetown speech was the contract to begin to build a radar system on an island in Alaska.

That is the only thing we can do right now. The system will not be ready for 5 years. But by delaying the contract to build the radar in Alaska, we cannot do the additional testing that we need. That radar would have helped us better test the system that President Clinton told the American people he wanted more testing of.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes the statements coming out really disgust me because they are not being challenged, because the President can use the bully pulpit to say whatever he wants any time he wants without the benefit of someone else standing up and saying, "Wait a minute, Mr. President. Let us look at the facts," because facts are difficult things to refute.

Now, the President also mentioned that he was delaying the decision on missile defense because our allies and other countries were being offended by what we were about to do. He cited Russia. He said that Russia was against missile defense. Russia will use this against us. China will use it. The European nations are against it.

Let us look at that also, Mr. Speaker, and let us look at the facts. Do the Russians trust us? No. Do I understand why the Russians do not trust us? Yes. Mr. Speaker, one of the other things I do in the Congress, as Members know, is I work Russia issues. My undergraduate degree is in Russian studies. I have been in that country 21 times. I co-chair the Interactive Caucus between their Duma and our Congress, so I am with Russians all the time. In fact, I was with the chairman of the International Affairs Committee just 1 hour ago, Mr. Ragsin from the Duma. I was with six other Russians earlier this morning. I meet with them every day.

Let us analyze why the Russians are upset with what we are doing with missile defense, and let us see if missile defense is the problem or if Bill Clinton is the problem and AL GORE is the problem.

Why would the Russians not trust America? Do they think we are going to try to take them over? Some do. Why would they think that? Are they confused? Yes. Why would they think that?

Let us go back to 1992, Mr. Speaker. Boris Yeltsin was elected president of Russia, a new democratic free market Nation. In one of his first speeches he

said "I challenge America to work together with Russia on developing a missile defense system that could protect both people."

George Bush was president back then. What was George Bush's response? George Bush says, "I accept your challenge, President Yeltsin. Let us work together." So our State Department and the Russian Foreign Ministry began high-level discussions. They were called the Ross-Mamedov talks, named after the Russian deputy foreign minister and our deputy secretary of state.

They met repeatedly. They were building confidence. They were having success in working together. Then things happened. The elections happened. Bush lost, and Clinton came in in 1993.

Within the first 3 months, what did Bill Clinton do, this man who believes that security is obtainable through arms control agreements alone? He canceled the discussions with the Russians. Without giving the Russians any reason, he canceled the Ross-Mamedov talks.

The Russians said, "Wait a minute. You said you wanted to work with us, America. Now you are saying you do not want to work with us." That was the first bad signal sent by America to the Russians that we do not want their cooperation, that we do not want to work with them.

A second event happened in 1995, 1996, and 1997. We had one cooperative program with Russia on missile defense called the RAMOS project. The RAMOS project is being done by the Utah-Russian Institute in Utah and the Komyeta Institute in Moscow. They have been working together for months and years in developing confidence on a joint system of using two satellites with identical capability, to build confidence that both countries will know when a rocket is launched.

The Russians were very enthusiastic about this program. It had strong bipartisan congressional support. What about the Clinton-Gore team? Without any advance notice to the Russians or to Congress, they announced they were canceling the funding for the RAMOS program.

The Russians started calling me frantically. The former ambassador to America, Vladimir Lukhin, who chairs the Yablakov faction, wrote me a letter. The chairman of the ministry of atomic energy, Mikaelov, wrote me a letter. They said, "You cannot let this happen. This is terrible. It undermines our relationship."

Only because Members of Congress joined together, and in this case, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), joined by myself and Members of both parties, said to the White House, "Oh, no, you don't. You are not canceling this program. It is too important for the confidence between America and Russia."

What do Members think the Russians thought? Here in 1993 they cancelled

the discussions between our two countries, in 1996 they cancelled the only cooperative program with America. What do Members think they are thinking? They are thinking that for some reason Clinton has some effort to not want Russia involved in missile defense.

Then came 1996 and 1997. What happened then? President Clinton decided that since he is a big arms control fan along with AL GORE, that instead of working to amend the ABM treaty, they are going to tighten the ABM treaty.

What is the ABM treaty? The ABM treaty is a relic of the Cold War. It was important at a time where we had two superpowers, the Soviet Union and America, each able to annihilate the other with their missiles, attacking each other. The theory behind it, which is where it got its name MYAD, was mutually-assured destruction. You attack us with your missile and we will wipe you out, if we attack you with our missile, we will wipe you out, neither side being able to build more than one defensive system around one city. That has been the basis of our relationship.

That treaty worked in the 1970s and 1980s when only two nations had that capability, the Soviet Union and America. How do we justify that treaty in the 1990s and the year 2000, when China now has at least 24 long-range ICBMs, when North Korea has at least two long-range ICBMs, when Iran will have within 5 years long-range ICBMs? How do we justify a theory of mutually-assured deterrence when those nations did not even sign the treaty?

What the President did, instead of working to defend our country, was he sent our negotiators to Geneva. They started meeting in Geneva to make the ABM treaty tighter as opposed to more flexible, a stupid decision on the face of it, but that is what they did.

Many of us in the Congress said, what in the world is the President doing? He and AL GORE have a negotiator in Geneva meeting with the Russians talking about making tighter changes to the ABM treaty. So Mr. Speaker, I did what none of our colleagues did, I went to Geneva. I flew over with a Navy escort. I got permission of the State Department. I said, I want to sit across from the Russians. I want to talk about what is going on here.

They let me, so we flew to Geneva and we went to the site where the meetings were taking place. I met the chief Russian negotiator, General Klotunov. I sat down across from him at a table for 2½ hours. I said, "General Klotunov, I am a Member of Congress. I really have some questions about these negotiations between your side and our side over the ABM treaty, so can I ask a couple of questions?"

"There are two issues evidently you are working on. One is you want to multilateralize the treaty; that is, to make a complicated story simple, you want to take a treaty between two countries, us and the former Soviet

Union, and you want to now include three other former Soviet States, Belarus, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan. So my question to you is, why would Russia want to include Belarus and Kazakhstan on a treaty when they don't have missiles? They gave all their missiles up? Why would you want them to be a player on a treaty where only us and Russia have these missiles, unless you want to expand it to include China or North Korea or these other nations?"

General Klotunov looked me in the eye, and in front of our negotiators and with a recorder taking all this down, said this publicly: "Congressman WELDON, you are asking that question of the wrong person. We didn't propose multilateralizing the treaty, your side did."

How in the world and why in the world would America want to make it more difficult to amend a treaty to let us protect our people? That is exactly what we did, Mr. Speaker. And Belarus, with a leader like Lukashenko, who is a crazy man, Belarus could object to a change in the treaty which would benefit us, and Russia could say, "we agree, but Belarus objects," and we could not deal with that issue.

I didn't understand what the President's reasoning was, and therefore I came back and told my colleagues, "I think this issue is a stupid issue and something we should not be doing with the Russians." But we agreed to it with the Russians. Bill Clinton agreed to it, and so did AL GORE.

The second issue I raised to Klotunov was demarcation. That is a long word, and very tough for somebody like me who is just a schoolteacher to understand what it meant. I had to get some people over to brief me. Demarcation was trying to decide what is a theater missile defense system versus national missile defense. For some reason, we picked a speed and a range that made a difference when one was theater and one was national.

If I live in Israel, a small country, a theater missile defense system is a national system, because it protects the whole country. For the State of Pennsylvania, a theater missile defense system really is a broader national missile defense system.

I could not understand how this difference was created. I asked General Klotunov, "How did you arrive at the numbers that we and you agreed to on demarcation between these systems?" He said, "Congressman, that was some very serious discussion between your State Department and our ministry of foreign affairs."

I said, "Well, can you share with me the basis of it?" He said, "No, it is too complicated." I was not satisfied. I came back to our country and asked the military to explain it. They did not have any good answers, or did not want to give them to me, so I did not get a satisfactory answer on that issue until about a year later.

I am sitting in my office, Mr. Speaker, and reading press accounts from

newspapers around the world, as I usually do, involving emerging threats to our security. Lo and behold, in a Tel Aviv newspaper I see a story with a headline, "Moscow offers to sell Israel newest missile defense system."

I read the story. It talks about a system I had not heard of called the ANTEI 2500, supposedly the best system in the world. I called the CIA, George Tenet. He is a very capable leader. I have a lot of respect for him.

I said, "Mr. Director, do you know what the system is?" He said, "Congressman WELDON, I don't, but we have experts in the agency. Let me get someone to come over and brief you." About a week later, an analyst from the CIA comes over to my office to talk about the ANTEI 2500.

I say to him, "Can you tell me about this system? I know most of the Russian systems. I know about the S300, S400, the system they are building, the SA10, the SA12. What is the ANTEI 2500?" He says, "It is a brand new system." I said, "Do we know about it?" He said, "Yes, we know about it." He pulled out a brochure in English with beautiful color pictures: "Here, this is for you."

I said, "What is this?" He said it was a marketing brochure in English that the Russians gave out at the Abu Dhabi air show offering to sell the system to any Nation that wanted to buy it. I said, "How good is it?" He said, "If it does what they say it will do, it is the best system in the world. On the back page of the brochure are all the criteria for this system."

As I read through it and looked at the range, the speed, something clicks in my head. I say, "Now, wait a minute." I looked at the analyst sitting across from me in my office.

□ 1745

The range and the speed of the system are right below the threshold of the demarcation.

He starts shaking his head. He said, "Yes, Congressman, you are right."

I said, "Are you kidding me?" I said, "What that means is, then, that we let ourselves get sucked into a negotiation by the Russians where they were building a system that we did not know about that they could market to our friends and our allies, yet we would limit our own ability to go beyond that."

He said, "Yes, that is exactly right."

What a way to negotiate treaties, Mr. Speaker. No wonder this Congress and the other body said we will never support those two changes to the treaty.

But to get back to my original point of the confidence of the Russians. Bill Clinton, as our representative said to the Russians, we support these two changes. He knew he had to take them back, according to our Constitution, and have the Senate give their advice and their consent. That is a requirement that even Bill Clinton cannot get around.

Well, do you know what he did. Because he knew he could not get those

two changes through the Senate, he did not bring them out for the Senate to consider for 3 years, for 3 years, after he convinced the Russians that those two changes were acceptable to America, the multilateralization and the demarcation. He left the Russians believing that America would support them.

So when the Russians passed START II just a couple of months ago, the Clinton administration had urged them to include both of those changes to embarrass the Senate. So that what they would not submit to the Senate 3 years ago they included as a part of START II so the Senate would have to vote down START II because those two changes were never submitted separately as required by the Constitution. Well, the Senate is not going to do that.

So for a third time, Bill Clinton convinces the Russians that we cannot be trusted.

Now, why would the President do this? Why would not he call the Russians when there are companies transferring technology? Why would he not be honest with the Russians?

Mr. Speaker, our policy for the past 8 years, under Bill Clinton, with Russia, has been based on the Clinton to Yeltsin personal friendship. That worked for the first 4 years.

As someone who has spent a lot of time in Russia, I supported the approach of helping Yeltsin succeed. I had the same hopes and dreams that all of us had and that Bill Clinton had.

But here is where we fell down. Instead of supporting the institution of the Presidency in Russia, the institution of a parliament in Russia, we supported a person. When that person became a drunken fool surrounded by corrupt oligarchs and bankers stealing money from the Russian people, we were still supporting him, the only people supporting him in the world.

When Boris Yeltsin's cronies were stealing billions of dollars of IMF money, \$18 billion that the Russian people were going to think helped them build roads and schools and bridges and community centers, Boris Yeltsin's friends and cronies stole that money and put it in Swiss bank accounts and U.S. real estate investments, and we went like this and like this.

Why would Bill Clinton do that? Because he did not want to embarrass his friend, Boris Yeltsin. When we caught the Russians doing stupid things like allowing transfers of technology to go abroad, we did not want to embarrass Yeltsin. When we caught them working with the Iranians, we did not want to embarrass Boris Yeltsin. When we caught them with the guidance systems to go to Iraq, it was the year Yeltsin was running for reelection.

In fact, we now have a secret cable that Bill Clinton sent to Boris Yeltsin which our colleagues and the American people can get if they buy the book "Betrayal" by Bill Gertz. In the back of that book is an appendix. In that appendix is a secret cable now released

that President Clinton sent to Boris Yeltsin in 1996 saying, "Dear Boris, I will make sure nothing happens to upset your election campaign."

As a result, Mr. Speaker, the Russian people lost confidence in America. They thought our only purpose was to steal their money, embarrass them, and not be candid with them.

As a result, when Boris Yeltsin was about to leave office this time last fall, his popularity in every poll in Russia was less than 2 percent. Nobody in Russia trusted Boris Yeltsin. Bill Clinton did. Bill Clinton was still his best friend.

Imagine this, Mr. Speaker, and picture this visually, imagine the euphoria in America, in 1992, you have got Boris Yeltsin standing on a tank outside the Russian White House in Moscow, waving a Russian flag with American flags all around him as thousands of Russians are chanting singing. Now they have overturned communism, and their newest ally and their friend is America. That was 1992.

Shift to 1999, last year in the fall. What is the picture out of Moscow, Mr. Speaker? I remember one picture last fall: 5,000 Russians standing outside of our embassy in Moscow, throwing paint at the American embassy, firing weapons in our embassy, and burning the American flag. It was so bad that our embassy had to tell Americans traveling in Moscow, do not speak English on the street.

That just did not happen, Mr. Speaker. It happened because the Russians no longer trusted who we are and what we were about. That was because this President had a foreign policy that was more like a roller coaster. Things were done to suit the political expediency of both President Clinton and President Yeltsin. That is why the Russians did not trust our movement on missile defense.

In fact, I have friends in Russia. One senior policy analyst who was doing an op ed with me entitled, "From Mutually Assured Destruction to Mutually Assured Protection." The Russians want to work with us. But they have no confidence in who we are as a people because of the policies of this administration.

The President worried about Russian response on the issue of missile defense. What about Kosovo, Mr. Speaker? Let us talk about Kosovo for a moment. President Clinton and Tony Blair went before the American and British people, interestingly enough, 30 days before a big NATO anniversary conference here in Washington a year ago in the spring.

Tony Blair and Bill Clinton said we are going to move NATO in a new direction. We are going to go in to Serbia. We are going to defeat Milosevic who is evil; who is corrupt. We are going to show that NATO has a new role in the world. We are going to bring Milosevic to his knees.

President Clinton said in justifying the use of our young people in Kosovo,

when we are done, we are going to find massive graves. There are going to be hundreds of thousands of people who were killed by Milosevic and buried throughout Serbia because of what he has done to people. Well, that is what the President says.

Let us look at what happened, Mr. Speaker. Here we are, the Kosovo conflict is over. The CIA came in and testified before Congress just 3 months ago, and I asked the question, "How many mass graves did we find because the President said there would be 100,000?"

The CIA said, "We would never say that."

I said, "Well, I know you are not the White House, but how many did you find?"

He said, "I think we found one grave."

"Well, how many were in there?"

"Well, we do not know, maybe 1,000, maybe more. We do not know whether they were mass graves or just people buried together."

So I said, "Well, the basic justification of the Kosovo war by our President was massive atrocities. Are you telling me they did not occur?"

He said, "Well, we do not have any evidence of mass graves."

It turns out, Mr. Speaker, the allies probably killed more innocent people than Milosevic did up until the war started. When the war started, he became more of a madman and killed more people. The bottom line is, Mr. Speaker, after it put America's sons and daughters in harm's way, after spending billions of dollars, after President Clinton going on national TV with Tony Blair, why is Milosevic still in power?

What did we do, Mr. Speaker? Did we fail? Has President Clinton come before the American people and said, I am sorry I failed. Our policy was a disaster.

What about the billions of dollars we spent? What did we accomplish with Kosovo. We killed innocent people. We did not remove Milosevic. Now, it has just turned itself around. Is the ethnic cleansing still going on? Yes. But instead of the Serbs beating up the Kosovars, the Kosovars are beating up the Serbs.

President Clinton does not want to talk about that now because the NATO anniversary celebration is over. They had the parades through Washington. The President and Tony Blair gave their speeches, so we have gone on to other issues.

So what was accomplished in Kosovo? I can think of two things. We managed to alienate the Russians. It is the number one issue on the mind of every Russian how America did not bring Russia in to help solve the Kosovo problem.

The second, we alienated China, because the Chinese are still convinced we hit their embassy deliberately in downtown Belgrade. When the President repeatedly said we did not, they still believed that we did.

The irony of this President's administration relative to our foreign would-be adversaries, China and Russia, is that, in 1992, Boris Yeltsin announced a new strategic partnership, Moscow and Washington together working as one.

In 1999, Boris Yeltsin, as he is leaving office, and President Putin as he went into office in 2000, made different speeches. They announced a new relationship, Moscow and Beijing against America. That is the legacy of Clinton and GORE on international security issues.

The President talks about Russia's response to our missile defense. Cut me a break, Mr. Speaker. The President is just not being honest with the American people.

Should the Russians worry about what we were doing with missile defense? No way. They have the best missile defense in the world. If the Russians really believed that missile defense was not important or we could rely on deterrence, why would they have the only operational AB instrument in the world, and they have it today. The Russians have the world's only operational antiballistic missile system. They have one, and we do not.

Theirs surrounds Moscow, which is where 80 percent of their people live. So with one system, they protect the bulk of their population. Certainly all the people that matter to them are around Moscow. They protect all of them.

Their system has been upgraded three times. So if the Russians really believe in deterrence, why do not we tell them to take down their system and be as vulnerable as we are. We in America who could build one system would never choose to protect one city over another. So we have no system.

So the irony is, Mr. Speaker, that the President said he did not go forward because Russia is concerned. Our allies are concerned, when the very reason they are concerned is because of the lack of a vision and the lack of statesmanship on the part of our White House, including our President and Vice President.

Where does this all come down to, Mr. Speaker? Well, what the President did by announcing his decision in Georgetown in his speech is going to cost us more money. The estimates are another \$1 billion with a 1-year delay in missile defense, \$1 billion that we are going to have to fork over. But more importantly, we are unprotected.

Now, some say, well, it is not going to happen. Let me remind my constituents and colleagues here in the Chamber. In 1991, 28 young Americans, half of them from Pennsylvania, came home in body bags because we let them down. We could not defend against a low complexity scud missile. Will that happen again? Well, I can tell my colleagues, in 1995, in January, because of Russia's problems in their military, when the Norwegians launched the weather rocket, a three-stage rocket for atmospheric sampling, the Russian

system is in such bad shape, they misread the Norwegian rocket launch. They thought it was an attack from an American nuclear submarine.

What did they do? The Russians have acknowledged that, for one of the first times ever, they put their full ICBM system on alert. Well, what does that mean? That meant Russia had 15 minutes, 15 minutes to decide whether to launch a missile against the U.S. or call it off.

Boris Yeltsin has publicly acknowledged, and I will put in the RECORD, there was 7 minutes left, he overruled his Defense Minister Pavel Grachev and the general in charge of his command staff and called off the response.

Imagine that, Mr. Speaker, in January of 1995, we almost had Russia launch an ICBM at America because of a Norwegian rocket launch that they had been told about. What would we have done if that launch would have occurred? We could not defend it because we have no system. Well, we do. We probably sent up a radio signal to wherever the trajectory was of that city and tell them over the radio, you have 25 minutes to vacate your homes, because that is how long it takes for an ICBM leaving Russia to hit America. Twenty-five minutes to move, that is the only protection that we could provide to the American people.

What are we going to do if that happens? If an accident occurs, what do we do, have Putin apologize to us, say, "Oh, we are sorry. We are sorry you lost 200,000 people in L.A. We are sorry that Atlanta, Georgia got bombed. We did not mean it. It was an accident."

What do we do if North Korea says, "We are going to test you, America. We are going to invade South Korea. If you interfere, L.A. is out the door." What do we do then, go in and bomb North Korea in advance, or do we wait until they launch their missile and then wonder whether we are going to attack North Korea later. What about the people in L.A.? Who is going to protect them?

Mr. Speaker, this President should not be allowed to get away with what he did. He lied to the American people. Our security is at risk. The same way he lied to the American people in the China technology transfer scandal.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I was a Member of the Cox committee. For 7 months, we sat through testimony and meeting after meeting with the CIA and the FBI. I saw all the evidence or most of it that the CIA and the FBI have relative to how the Chinese got technology from America.

Mr. Speaker, through all of that evidence that we saw, nine of us, four Democrats and five Republicans, nine decent people voted unanimously, nine to zero that America's security was harmed because of technology that was transferred to China.

Now, the administration would have us believe it was stolen. Wen Ho Lee, the poor man, just got released after 9 months. They said it was stolen. It was not stolen.

□ 1800

It was not stolen. It was a wholesale auctioning off of America's technology.

What did they get in return? They got campaign dollars. The same man going around the country championing campaign finance reform obtained millions of dollars, hundreds of millions of dollars for his campaign committee.

This is not the Republican gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) talking, Mr. Speaker. I would offer to my colleagues a letter that Louis Freeh, one of the people in this administration with integrity, the head of the FBI, hand picked by Bill Clinton and Janet Reno, Louis Freeh wrote a 90-page memorandum based on a factual investigation by his investigator, Charles Labella.

That 90-page memorandum went to Janet Reno. It is now available. I will give it to anybody that wants it, and they can read it for themselves, in Louis Freeh's own words. What did it say? It said: "As the FBI Director of America, I have reason to believe that further investigation is warranted because four people may have committed felonies in campaign contributions being received with technology being left out of our country to go to a foreign nation."

And Louis Freeh named the four people. Who were they? In Louis Freeh's own words: Bill Clinton, Hillary Clinton, AL GORE, and Harold Ickes, who is running Hillary's campaign in New York State.

The scandal of this administration was not Monica Lewinsky. The scandal of this administration was the wholesale auctioning off of America's technology so that Clinton and GORE could get reelected.

And now we have the President giving a speech at Georgetown about how he is making the right decision for us on protecting our people.

The White House should be ashamed. America should be ashamed. And all of us had better look to the facts as opposed to the wink and the nod and the smile.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VITTER). The Chair would remind Members that remarks in debate should not include charges against the President or Vice President.

PRINTING IN THE RECORD FOR THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 18, 2000

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the schedule for the week of September 18 be inserted in the RECORD immediately after the end of legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

BALANCED BUDGET ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like for my 5 minutes to be joined by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), to talk about one of the real health care crises that we have.

We are going to hear a lot about health care in the next 8 weeks, issues that we hope to address, the Patients' Bill of Rights, prescription drug coverage. But there is really a more pressing issue out there, and that is the effect of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 on health care providers.

My colleague, the gentleman from Chicago, Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), and I had a hearing in Chicago on August 28 in which we had providers come testify about the impact of the Balanced Budget Act. And they are serious and they are important.

They are so important that we have come down to the floor to just start the drumbeat of noise so that before we end this legislative session we have some assistance and aid to our health care providers who are really working in the field to address some of the funding shortfalls.

The Balanced Budget Act was passed in order to reduce the deficit and balance our Nation's budget and control health care entitlement spending. I am proud to say that that goal was accomplished but with some unintended consequences, as so happens in legislation.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the actual reductions brought about by the Balanced Budget Act, including the adjustment in the Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act that we passed last year, 1999, are \$124 billion, that is "billion" with a "b," more than Congress voted for when we passed the Balanced Budget Act.

We heard a lot of testimony. I would like to quote Allan Gaffner of Utlaut Memorial Hospital in my Congressional district: "The Balanced Budget Act will cause Utlaut Extended Care Unit to lose revenue totaling \$185,000 in 2000. Last year the unit lost an average of \$190,000. From 1999 through 2003, the Extended Care Unit is projected to operate with \$1 million less revenue than before the Balanced Budget Act was instituted. The total Medicare operating margin of Utlaut last year was a negative 10.8 percent."

Let me rephrase that.

The total Medicare operating margin, that is our promise to our seniors, we paid our providers 10.8 percent below the cost of providing that service.

I do not see how they survive.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Chicago, Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here to share in this Special Order with my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased on August 28 to cosponsor a statewide hearing on the impact of the Balanced Budget Act on hospitals in the State of Illinois. And they came from all over the State:

from down state, central Illinois, from Chicago, the northern part of the State, the University of Illinois Hospital, Rush Presbyterian, St. Lukes Medical Center, Cook County Hospital, Northwestern University Hospital, Bethany Hospital, the Illinois Home Health Association, the Illinois Nursing Home Association, Community Health Centers, the University of Chicago, Home Health Agencies, the National Hospice Association.

All of them saying essentially the same thing and that is, while they recognize and appreciate the fact that we need to reduce waste and fraud and abuse in the Medicare program, in all of our health programs, in the Medicaid program, the one thing that they also understood is that we have gone too far with the Balanced Budget Act and we have actually cut services in institutions that we cannot afford to cut. We have thrown out in many instances the baby with the bath water.

And so I join with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and others in calling for another look at the impact of the Balanced Budget Act. We must find a way to save these institutions which are teetering.

I am pleased to join with the gentleman tonight.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would also like to highlight another issue that was raised, which was the intergovernmental transfer issue, which HCFA is going to oppose on States.

HCFA has approved the Illinois program 22 times over the years without any indication there was a problem. Now they are going to promulgate a rule, and it is going to take an additional, and this is an additional more than what has been affected in the Balanced Budget Act, \$500 million from the health care delivery system in the State of Illinois.

Ann Patla, who testified before our hearing, said this would be catastrophic and it is a critical issue we need to be concerned of.

I would like to thank my colleague for coming down to the floor. Time is running shy. But we will be back to talk about real health care problems in America, and that is the Balanced Budget Act's impact on health care and also the intergovernmental transfer issue.

The Balanced Budget Act was passed in order to reduce the deficit and balance our nation's budget.

I am proud to say that our goal was accomplished and we are now working with a budget surplus.

However, the BBA resulted in unintended consequences, cutting much more funding out of the Medicare system than was originally intended.

According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), the actual reductions brought about by the BBA—including the adjustment in the BBRA of 1999—are \$124 billion more than Congress voted for when passing the 1997 BBA.

Dean Harrison from the Northwestern Memorial Hospital:

Approximately 30 percent of the Northwestern Memorial Hospital's patient volume are Medicare beneficiaries, and they account for 37 percent of its patient days due to their longer length of stay. As a result, the BBA cuts in Medicare reimbursement will mean a total loss to NMH of an estimated \$65 million over the course of the five-year schedule of reductions. . . . The total negative Medicare margin will double from 1999 to negative 11.6 percent for the year 2000."

John Buckley, Jr. from Southern Illinois Healthcare:

[The] outpatient reimbursement situation isn't much brighter. Since the BBA was implemented three years ago, the reimbursement has fallen steadily, from 97% of costs in FY 1997 to 89% of costs in FY 2000. . . Without additional BBA relief, out-patient losses will exceed \$1 million.

BBA spending reductions are forcing hospitals to lay off staff, cancel much-needed upgrades of facilities and equipment, and shut down critical services like home health care and other needed programs that cannot be maintained without compromising quality.

Allan Gaffner of Edward Utlaut Memorial Hospital testified:

As a result of the Balanced Budget Act cuts, the Utlaut Rehabilitation Department, which provides therapy services to the Extended Care Unit patients, was reduced to 54 percent. The Utlaut Rehabilitation Department, which previously consisted of 13 staff members, now has only six staff members. The limit on therapy services as covered by the Medicare Skilled Nursing Facility rules is delaying a return to health and greater independence. Rather than receiving as many as two hours of physical occupational and speech therapy services per day, Medicare patients are limited to a maximum of 75 minutes a day.

John Buckley, Jr. from Southern Illinois Health Care:

Access to home health care is suffering in the communities Southern Illinois Healthcare serves. Because of the BBA spending cuts, we are serving 1,000 fewer patients and providing 86,000 fewer home health visits than we did three years ago. On top of that, we've had to lay off 150 staff members. Even with those dramatic cutbacks, we still lost nearly \$1.2 million on home health services in FY 2000.

Dean Harrison from the Northwestern Memorial Hospital:

Continuation and expansion of cost control efforts and the elimination of some services have allowed NMH to endure the cutbacks in Medicare thus far. In recognition of the effect the BBA would have on NMH, the hospital's skilled nursing facility was closed in early 1998 due to losses the unit was already incurring and a negative prognosis for its survival under the BBA.

According to HCFA: 933,687 Medicare beneficiaries will lose health maintenance organization coverage in January. Many of these people are left with no other Medicare options.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL TRANSFERS (IGTS)

Illinois hospitals are also very concerned about a rule HCFA is threatening to issue that would restrict intergovernmental transfers by limiting the amount that can be paid to county hospitals and nursing homes under the Medicaid "upper limit" rule.

HCFA has approved the Illinois program 22 times over the years without any indication that there was a problem.

The first time state officials were notified that HCFA had concerns was when the agen-

cy indicated they were issuing a rule against IGTS.

If the rule is enacted as proposed it would slash up to \$500 million in health care funding for low income residents of Illinois. This makes no sense, especially as the number of uninsured Americans continues to skyrocket.

After talking to hospital leaders back home, I am convinced that the Administration should not proceed with a rule that threatens the already fragile health care safety net across the country.

Ann Patla, Director of the Illinois Department of Public Aid:

If this federal regulation is adopted, the loss of funding will devastate the largest health care system in Illinois, operated by Cook County, and will severely impair the State's ability to serve Medicaid participants in all other counties. The State may be forced to: (1) seek repeal of recent health care expansions for the elderly and disabled; (2) retreat from rate reforms that encourage access to preventive and lower cost health care; (3) reduce outreach programs to encourage the use of Medicaid and SCHIP; and (4) substantially cut rates to FQHCs, hospitals, physicians, and other providers who serve Medicaid and SCHIP participants, as well as almost two million uninsured Illinoisans.

If some states are abusing IGTS—by using them to pay for highway repairs or tax cuts, for example—then regulatory changes should be targeted at curbing those abuses.

HCFA's current proposal, however, penalizes states like Illinois which use IGTS to maintain a health care safety net for low income residents.

A rule change, if one is needed, should preserve the legitimate and appropriate use of IGTS to provide health care for low-income persons.

INPATIENT SERVICE REIMBURSEMENTS (H.R. 3580)

BBA reduces Medicare payments for hospital services. Medicare provides payment updates below the marketbasket index.

Over 1998, 1999, and 2000 hospital inflation rates rose 8.2 percent, while the payment updates totaled 1.6 percent.

Below inflation updates coupled with rising costs associated with wage increases, prices per prescription for new drugs, new blood screening techniques, and mandated changes for compliance with administrative simplification and privacy are additional costs for hospitals.

How do we expect hospitals to maintain quality services when their reimbursement rates are so low?

We should pass a reform package that includes legislation to repeal Medicare inpatient update reductions of 1.1 percent scheduled for FY 2001 and FY 2002. To this end, I have co-sponsored H.R. 3580, the "Hospital Preservation and Equity Act."

Northwestern Memorial Hospital testified:

[H.R. 3580] recognizes that Medicare reimbursement to hospitals does not keep pace with the costs of caring for patients and would repeal the BBA's payment to hospitals for Medicare inpatient services for FYs 2001 and 2002.

Illinois Hospital and HealthSystems Association testified:

Recently the Medicare Payment Assessment recommended that Congress address the inpatient PPS update. MedPAC is the independent body that advises Congress on Medicare payment rates. Its data analysis

show that nearly 35% of the nation's hospitals are operating in the red.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. STABENOW addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HURRICANE FLOYD DISASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, this evening for the first portion of my special order I want to take about 5 minutes to raise an issue.

On the eve of 1 year ago, on almost the same date, one of the most destructive storms ever to hit my State came upon the shores. On September 15, 1999, Hurricane Floyd made landfall at the mouth of the Cape Fear River in North Carolina.

Floyd moved into the interior of my State and over the next couple of days proceeded to dump anywhere from 10 to 20 inches of rain in towns and communities and farm areas in parts of eastern North Carolina. These rains came only 12 days after the region was hit with pounding rains by Hurricane Dennis.

To call the results devastating would be an understatement. Our citizens suffered a full-blown catastrophe of monumental proportions.

Floyd produced the worst flooding in North Carolina history, with water exceeding what has been called the 500-year flood plain.

In North Carolina alone, Floyd was responsible for 7,000 homes being de-

stroyed and 56,000 homes damaged. We can see from this photograph taken only a couple days after the rains as the flood waters had risen a whole town underwater. More than 500,000 people suffered without power for weeks on end. Damage estimates in my State range anywhere from \$4.5 billion to over \$6 billion.

Many people lost everything that they own. They lost their possessions, their homes, their farms, their cars, their clothing, their sentimental items that we rarely think about until they are gone: wedding photographs, military awards, the children's first report cards, love letters, those kind of things we cannot replace.

Jobs were lost because businesses were too flooded to reopen, making it that much harder for families to rebuild. And worst of all, Mr. Speaker, 506 people lost their lives, most of them due to drowning in fresh water.

I remember driving back to North Carolina that night and running into the storm on my way home. I remember touring the regions in the days that followed and seeing schools, homes, businesses, churches, entire towns flooded, as we see here.

At the peak of the emergency, 235 public shelters housed people. Almost 50,000 people were in shelters. I remember visiting them looking into their eyes and seeing the fear, the desperation, the hopelessness that those people felt. These were the images that no amount of time will ever replace.

In the face of so much destruction, so much suffering, it was inspiring to witness the people and the communities coming together and responding to disaster with the spirit of generosity and cooperation. People from all over North Carolina provided the victims of Floyd not only tangible items, like money, food, and supplies, but also equally important intangible things, their thoughts, their prayers, and their letters of support.

Another precious commodity donated was the time and effort countless thousands of North Carolinians gave. Volunteers aided in evacuation and rescue efforts and cleanups that affected towns and the care and treatment of families that were forced to live in shelters.

In addition, those volunteers provided valuable assistance and support to State emergency management personnel who worked untold hours. They led a valiant effort to respond to the needs of these victims, saving countless lives of people from all across this country and also donated to the cause of recovery.

I am so grateful for the many acts of generosity by my fellow Americans who saw people were hurting and decided to help. Yes, they sent money; but they sent a lot of other things. We even had schoolbooks delivered from as far away as Hawaii by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), here in this body.

From the governor to our own State's delegation here in Congress,

from Federal agencies to local leaders, the assistance North Carolina received provided absolutely critical help to our people.

□ 1815

One year later, my State is still rebuilding, and we will be rebuilding for months, if not years, to come.

It is the assistance provided by my fellow Americans that made this possible, and as we reconstruct our State we are taking the necessary steps to provide for future disasters. By making our towns and cities more disaster resistant, we can reduce the loss of lives and property and lessen the devastating impact of future storms. If this storm did anything it proved determination and resolve of the indomitable spirit of the people of North Carolina. Our people come by the name Terrell honestly because we stand firm in the face of adversity. If anything knocks us down, we get right back up and fight another day.

Floyd dealt my State a crippling blow; but we are working to put our lives, our homes, our communities and ourselves back together. The people of North Carolina will never forget what happened in those days in September and the months that followed. Floyd has become part of our history, our culture, and our common experience. As Americans do when looking back upon a tragedy of this proportion, we were continually praying for our lost souls, comforting the anguished and distraught, honoring our heroes, rebuilding our homes and communities and looking toward the future.

THE IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATION

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I am joined this evening by a number of my colleagues to talk about an issue of equal importance to this Congress and to our Nation and, yes, to our leadership in the world: Education.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the critical needs of school construction, the shortage of teachers, the need to honor our teachers in a way that we have not done before. The critical need for construction in our communities across this country is at a crisis proportion.

I will be joined this evening by a number of my colleagues whom I will recognize in just a moment, who will discuss with me and with my colleagues the specific needs and plans that we have to help address these problems.

First, let me take just a moment to talk about some of the conditions in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand this evening a report prepared by the minority staff of the Committee on Government Reform's special investigative committee which is entitled K-3 Class Sizes in the North Carolina Research Triangle Region. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and I asked that this be done for our congressional districts, and this report has some startling numbers. It shocked the people in our congressional districts and it

should shock all Americans that care about children and care about the future of America, and we want to talk about that this evening.

Although there is much debate and an awful lot of rhetoric in this town about education, I believe we need to stick to the facts, and here are some of the facts. Fact number one, last year in one of our countries, Wake County, a portion of my district, another portion of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), over 95 percent, let me repeat that again, over 95 percent of the young children in K-3 were taught in classrooms that exceeded the national goal for classroom size. Across this 13-county region, 91 percent of the children in kindergarten through the third grade were taught in classes that exceeded the 18-person goal.

I went into a classroom in Lee County where a teacher had 29 children in the kindergarten classroom with no help. Five of those children spoke no English and their parents spoke no English. Three only had limited English.

Now, my wife and I, we are fortunate. We have three great children. I would not want 29 children that I had to deal with at any one time in our house. I would have a difficult time. And to deal with young children in kindergarten by yourself with those numbers, one cannot do it; one absolutely cannot teach. They are keeping school. There is a difference between keeping school and teaching school, and that is just not acceptable.

More troubling is the fact that a whopping 42.5 percent of K-3 students in Wake County are in large classrooms of 25 students or more, and I can say that is repeated in a lot of places across this country. Not surprisingly, small class sizes lead to greater academic achievement. If the class size is reduced, academic achievement follows. How do we get there? We are going to talk about that this evening, not only in K-3 but all across America.

The report demonstrates that class size reduction in the early grades is one of the most direct and effective ways to improve educational performance. I really did not need the study to tell me that. I have known that for a long time. Having served as a superintendent for my State schools for 8 years, I knew that before I came to Congress. Sometimes we need a report to verify it, to reinforce it so people will understand it and it gives credibility.

Last month, the U.S. Department of Education reported that my State's high school enrollment will skyrocket by 26 percent over the next decade. We will be the fourth fastest growing State in America. I think California is first; Texas and several others. But it is just tremendous. We are growing rapidly in this country. We have to meet those demands. We now have more children in public schools, 53 million, than at any time in the history of America. We know the problem is only going to get

worse. It is not going to get better. We have to deal with it, and local schools need help and they need us in Washington to get together and help. We have an opportunity to do it.

I have a son who taught the second grade, then the fourth grade. Now he is a special teacher. Brian is a great teacher, but one cannot be a good or a great teacher when they are in overcrowded classrooms, poorly lighted, poorly ventilated and all the problems that are associated with it, because in this country we have teachers teaching in converted bathrooms. We have them teaching in closets, in basements and a lot of trailers. I will go into that later this evening, but we have to reach out and use the resources that we have to make a difference for our children.

It is hard to tell a child education is the most important thing they are about and we send them to an old run-down school as they ride by some nice prison or a nice other building. Children do not have to be told. They know what is important.

Mr. Speaker, I would be happy now to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT), who has joined us this evening, because he has some important things to say. He has been involved in this educational issue all of his career, and we are glad to have him in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I will now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT).

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I might say to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), I am glad he commented on Hurricane Floyd, the flooding in North Carolina. As the gentleman knows, once upon a time the State of Tennessee was part of the great State of North Carolina, and North Carolinians did rise to the occasion, and I would like to say for the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, everyone wanted to help and assist, knowing that this was a time of emergency; that we needed to come to the rescue of these wonderful people that were having such a difficult time.

I know we are all here tonight, and I am pleased to be here with the gentleman, because I know the gentleman is such a leader in education and in so many other areas, but also our other colleagues, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), who I have worked with in the past very closely, also the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), and I might say she had a wonderful husband who was a Member of Congress that served so well and ably here, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT). It is a pleasure to be with all of them to talk about something that is near and dear to my heart, and that is education.

I am a former college president, and I will never forget my first day in Congress. People would come up to me and say, boy, you are a Congressman now. That is really something.

I would say that is right, but the last 4½ years they have called me Mr. President. Well, I am pleased to be a Congressman and still be involved and engaged in education, and I am currently co-chair of the House Education Caucus with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), who is also a former college president.

I know firsthand the importance of public schools and the value of a good education. Our children from Tennessee and all across the country are back in school again learning. I think it is appropriate for us in Congress to pledge to these students that we will do everything possible to ensure that they receive a quality education in quality schools by quality teachers. We cannot expect our children to reach their potential if school facilities, as the gentleman mentioned, are inadequate; if they do not have access to computers and the Internet or if their teacher is trying to teach in an overcrowded classroom.

I am pleased to join with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in cosponsoring H.R. 4094, America's Better Classrooms Act, which will provide much needed school construction funds. A report issued by the National Education Association found that upwards of \$254 billion is needed to accommodate growing school enrollments, fix deteriorating buildings and wire schools to be on the Internet.

The average public school today is over 42 years old. School enrollment is already at a record level and expected to continue to grow, which will lead to further overcrowding and a greater need for modernization. Research shows what parents already know. Students learn best when they are in a safe, modern school with small classes, with 21st century technology. The Federal Government has a responsibility to provide States and localities with financial assistance for education. H.R. 4094 will provide tax incentives to State and local governments to build state-of-the-art classrooms that will make all neighborhood public schools a better place for our children.

In addition, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in calling for adequate funding to be provided in the appropriation bills for school construction and smaller class size initiatives. I sincerely hope that we can find a way to fund these important priorities. If we are to continue to prosper economically, America must have an education policy that provides the best school facilities and smaller classes for all of our children. Modern schools and small class sizes lay the foundation for success, but in today's world of technology and the global economy an education that ends with a high school diploma is simply not enough. A 4-year college degree is increasingly considered the minimum education for a large proportion of high school skills and jobs that people want. An annual income for a person with a college degree is nearly twice that of someone with just a high school diploma.

Unfortunately, the cost of higher education has been a deterrent to many who wish to continue their education. However, this should not be the case. Assistance must be available to make college possible for every student if they want to pursue an education, whether it is a college degree or some other form of education. We cannot afford to let higher education be out of reach of those students who wish and desire to further their education. No student, regardless of socioeconomic background, should be deprived of something as priceless as an education.

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) knows and I know that the cost of education is going up and up and up. In 1997, 1998, tuition room and board, \$8,000 at the 4-year public colleges and universities. For the private counterpart, it is over \$24,000. I know that as a parent having children in college today. During the 1999/2000 academic year, students received more than \$65 billion in financial aid. Often the financial aid process can be confusing and overwhelming to parents, students and those involved in higher education and yet financial aid is often the key, not only to higher education but a successful future.

I will tell all of my colleagues what I did last weekend and it really worked. I joined with the Sallie Mae Trust for Education, and I encourage all to do the same thing, in hosting an event in Nashville, Tennessee, on paying for college. This seminar brought together representatives from Sallie Mae, the Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation and representatives from area colleges and universities to discuss with parents and students the availability of financial aid. With over 280 participants, the forum was a wonderful opportunity to share information on financial aid with parents and students. I think parents came away with a better understanding of exactly what kinds of assistance is available through the local, State, and Federal government, private lending institutions and individual schools and how to apply for it.

□ 1830

This kind of assistance is critical in helping our children attend college; however, we in Congress have an obligation as well. If we expect to continue American dominance in the 21st century, we must fund such critical financial aid programs as Pell grants, Perkins loans and Federal work study programs. These initiatives allow millions of students to attend college who otherwise never would.

These are investments whose returns far exceed the outlay. America has always been the land of opportunity for everyone. We simply cannot allow our schools to decay, our classes to spill out into hallways and our colleges to become a privilege enjoyed by a select few. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) for giving me the opportunity to fight for education

on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT) for his comments, but, more importantly, for his commitment to education and his hard work.

As we continue in this special order, I am pleased to be joined by the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), my friend and fellow colleague, who has really been a leader in education. She understands the needs of students. She came to this body with her husband. She is a nurse by training. She understands what the need is, and she fought for children to have a decent classroom in California, which is another one of those States that is busting at the seams.

I yield to her for her comments.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), my colleague, for yielding to me. We are going to make this an across-the-country discussion this evening of this issue of such great importance.

Mr. Speaker, I am here this afternoon to discuss an issue of such great importance in my district and across this country: school construction and modernization. Last week, I visited Peabody Charter School in Santa Barbara, California. At Peabody School, students receive a top-notch education. Unfortunately, these students also feel the disturbing effects of overcrowding and inadequate school facilities.

This is a school built for 200 students. Today it has an enrollment of way over 600 students. In an attempt to accommodate, portable classrooms take up precious playground space which should be used so that students can take part in physical activity, an important part of their education. Peabody School is one school in my district, which I am using this afternoon as an example to represent the dozens of overcrowded schools in my district. There are dozens of schools like this school, overcrowded and antiquated, in California and across this country.

It seems rather amazing to me that as we begin this new century in this country, with unparalleled prosperity before us, relatively at peace in the world, that we are allowing our most precious resource, our children, to face their future preparing for it in circumstances that are far from ideal, that in many instances are totally unsatisfactory.

Mr. Speaker, yes, public education in this country, one of our most important hallmarks, is a matter for local control; but I believe these issues are so pressing that there is a role for all of us to play. In my opinion and in my belief, the Federal Government can help to free up needed funds so that local districts can make the decisions they know best for the children in their communities.

And I have here today a letter to our bipartisan House and Senate leadership asking that they allow and encourage

the passage of H.R. 4094, the America's Better Classrooms Act before this session of Congress comes to a close.

This letter is signed by over 300 students from Peabody School. I have the letter here. I have two signatures along with mine, and then I have a collection of pages with signatures, second graders, third graders, fourth graders, fifth grade, sixth grade, 300 students in this school. They asked me if I would bring this letter with their signatures; and I told them that I would not only bring it to Congress with me, but that I would carry it with me to the floor and stand here in the well and give their testimony to this House and to the Senate so that we can meet their expectations.

These students were very excited to take part in this process, since overcrowded schools is something they know all about. It is an issue that affects their lives on a daily basis. In signing this letter, Peabody students are really making a statement about their educational environment and helping to improve the lives of future Peabody students. And they are actually speaking for students in their situations across this country.

The America's Better Classrooms Act has bipartisan support and 225 cosponsors. It would provide approximately \$25 billion in interest-free funds to State and local governments, for local school construction, and modernization projects. The funding would help schools like Peabody make improvements to classrooms and playgrounds and would help to reduce class size.

Here in Congress, we must set our standards high to ensure that all children deserve to have safe, clean and modern schools to attend each day. And, Mr. Speaker, my friends at Peabody Charter School ask us that we bring H.R. 4094 to the floor for a vote before this session of Congress comes to a close. I thank the students, my friends, for sharing and asking, along with me, for this vote. We owe them the best we can offer them.

The business world, which has helped to bring our economy to the fast pace that it enjoys today, knows the importance of investing in infrastructure, and here our most precious resource, the key to the future and for future economic development, our children, ask nothing less that we pay attention to their surroundings and their learning environment. In doing that, we will assist them in becoming the best that America can be for the rest of this century and on into the future.

I thank my friends at Peabody School. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), the former superintendent.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
September 11, 2000.

Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,
House Speaker,
U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.
Hon. RICHARD GEPHARDT,
House Minority Leader,
U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.
Hon. TRENT LOTT,
Senate Majority Leader,
U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.
Hon. TOM DASCHLE,
Senate Minority Leader,
U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS: We are writing to ask for your help with a long standing problem in our schools here on the Central Coast—overcrowding. Before the 106th Congress comes to a close, we ask that you pass H.R. 4094—the America's Better Classrooms Act—an important piece of legislation that would help improve Central Coast students' learning environments.

At Peabody Charter School, students receive a top-notch education, but also feel the effects of overcrowding. Imagine how hard it would be for members of Congress to concentrate and work in conditions similar to those found at Peabody. Unfortunately, overcrowding problems exist in schools across the country, and we know this can have an impact on students education.

H.R. 4094, which has bi-partisan support and 225 co-sponsors, would provide approximately \$25 billion in interest-free funds to State and local governments for school construction and modernization projects. This funding would help schools like Peabody make improvements to classrooms, playgrounds and would help reduce class sizes.

We must set our standards high to ensure that all children have a healthy start. All children deserve to have safe, clean, modern schools to attend each day. And so, my friends at Peabody Charter School and I ask that you bring H.R. 4094 to the floor for a vote before this session of Congress comes to a close. The congressional session is coming to an end, but Peabody students have a lifetime of learning ahead and need your help.

Sincerely,

LOIS CAPPS,
Member of Congress.

NICK HILL,
MILAGROS MACIAS,
Peabody Charter
School Students.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California (Mrs. CAPPS) for her remarks, and I thank the children. We tend to forget here sometimes that it really is about them. We get to dealing with a lot of weighty issues, and they are important. But in the end, most of us, if we are honest with ourselves, it is really about our children, our other children. And all the issues of security, safety, et cetera is about that, and that is why I introduced the bill early on for school construction.

I am glad to see the kind of structures taken, and I would say to my colleagues that in addition to those 200-some people that signed, the leadership in this body has still refused to bring it up. We have now drafted a letter, and we have over 150 of our colleagues having signed it to go to the President. I hope all the rest of them will sign it by next week, encouraging them not to give in on any issue until we get some school construction money for children across this country.

My friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), has been a real leader. He came here as a teacher. He still is teaching us about the importance of education. I am glad to have him join us this evening in this Special Order, and I yield to him.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), for yielding to me. I am pleased to be here with the gentleman on his Special Order this evening to talk and focus on school construction and talk about the implications that that has for education overall.

I do thank the gentleman for setting up these Special Orders. The gentleman has been a leader in education, starting with his school board back home and going through his time as State superintendent of schools in North Carolina and then preceding me here in the House of Representatives. The gentleman has been a true leader.

Mr. Speaker, I visited nearly 100 schools in my district; and everywhere I go across the five counties that I represent, I hear from parents and teachers and administrators and students about the problems of overcrowding. It is no wonder the number of school children, certainly in my part of the country and in many other parts of the country, is setting record levels.

We are experiencing what is sometimes called the echo of the baby boom, and there are schools where the student population has doubled in the past 10 years. I can show my colleagues school districts where the kindergarten is twice the size of the 12th grade. We do not have to have higher mathematics to understand the implications of that for school construction.

The classrooms are overcrowded. To alleviate this, many schools are turning to trailers. Trailers may be a temporary solution. In one place in my district, in one school district, in fact, at one school, there are 18 temporary trailers out back, and another three in the school next door and others that will be moved in in coming weeks.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Reclaiming my time, this gives me an opportunity to really talk about the heart of the issue. We have the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), and if he will join us here we can get into it. When we talk about that, what many people who are not in the school fail to see is we have those extra students in trailers or in closets or wherever, and most cases we do not increase the size of the cafeteria where children eat or the media center or the libraries, as many of us would think of years ago, nor the bathroom where children need to go, all of those extra facilities that teachers need to take. And if they are out in a trailer outside when it rains, what happens to the children? They get wet.

Mr. HOLT. If the gentleman would yield, the students tell me that they get teased because they get wet going back to the classes that they have in the other building, and these trailers are not a cheap solution either. They

are expensive to install, expensive to maintain. And what I am struck by is that their long and narrow floor plan makes them really totally unsuitable for instruction.

I asked a teacher, well, what do you do when you need to write on the blackboard, because the students on either wing cannot see the blackboard, and he said, well, he has to talk about word by word or number by number what he is writing on the blackboard and hope they can take it down. That is no way to teach children.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. On that point, reclaiming my time, if I may, I would ask my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) to join us. The gentleman and I visited a number of schools, and let me say I appreciate him joining us this evening. Not only has he been a leader in this, but a leader in trying to find us teachers we are going to need to fill those extra classrooms we are going to build, because he has a piece of legislation on it, and he was kind enough to let me join him and be a part of it; and I think the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is on it also. He has seen this, and he has been a fighter. Not only is he a teacher, but he has taught a lot of us here how important it is for education.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for calling this Special Order and for helping us focus our attention here in this critical closing period of the 106th Congress on our education needs.

My colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), referred earlier to this study, which the minority staff of the Committee of Government Reform and Oversight has carried out, showing that 90-plus percent of our students in our part of North Carolina are in classrooms of larger than the recommended size. This is children grades K through three, when we know class size matters most.

The gentleman and I took a tour a few days ago to unveil this report. We went to an elementary school in Cary, North Carolina, in my district, and then in Raleigh and then in Wake Forest; and as he has already said, we witnessed the situation there. I must say that the teachers and the students are making the best of the situation. They have made these trailers attractive, and they have made the best of it.

But in some of these schools, the children are eating lunch at 10:15, 10:30 in the morning, and as late as 1 o'clock and 1:30 in the afternoon simply because the central facilities had not caught up with all the additional population of the school occupying these trailers. And the same is true of the bathrooms; the same is true of the athletic facilities. It is unjust in a country as wealthy and as prosperous as ours when we know, when we know beyond a shadow of a doubt that children's ability to learn and teacher's ability to

teach is linked to a decent class size. I just think it is unconscionable that we are not addressing that situation.

□ 1845

I think local and state authorities often are doing the best they can. On this tour with us, we had the county superintendent of schools, we had school board members, we had county commissioners. There is no question we are in this together, and nobody is blaming the other. It is a matter of working together at all levels of government and making the Federal Government and especially the Federal Tax Code a partner in what we need to achieve. It is that kind of partnership we are looking for.

If we can get this legislation on the floor in these closing weeks, I believe we can do great things to bring 100,000 new teachers into the classrooms of America and to expand our schools and to modernize those schools.

Mr. HOLT. If the gentleman will yield. Of course the real purpose of our being here this evening is to call attention to the action that we have yet to take here in the House of Representatives, to call on the leadership to act on these bills.

The school construction bill is a wonderful partnership between the Federal Government and the local school district, and it is applicable not just in schools that are overcrowded because of a booming population, such as in my district. It is also applicable to the school districts where the schools are aging.

Across the country the average age of a school now is well beyond what a business or industry would consider satisfactory for use. It is well into the 40 years for an average school. In New Jersey it is actually closer to 50 years for the average age of schools. We have all heard stories of ceiling collapses, of teachers who put cheesecloth over the vents to stop the lead paint flecks from coming in to the classroom.

Estimates by the civil engineering societies say that school construction is the number one infrastructure need of the United States of America, and to put America's classrooms reasonably up-to-date would have a price tag of several hundreds of billions of dollars.

The school construction legislation that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) has presented to us as a companion piece to that that is sponsored by Representatives JOHNSON and RANGEL that would be a great boon to school districts that have aging schools and to school districts where the population is booming and they cannot keep up the construction, have enough construction to keep up with the population, and in the school districts who need to build so that they can have enough classrooms to have the smaller class sizes that are ideal for education.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield just for a moment. I want to under-

score something the gentleman said just a moment ago about the way this legislation would work and the fact that decisions about when and if to build would remain under local control.

We are not suggesting, and this is the genius, I think, of the Etheridge proposal and that of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the President has made similar proposals targeting low-income schools and high growth schools. The genuineness of that proposal I think is that it would leave the decision in local hands, it would leave the responsibility about issuing the bonds and raising the funds in local hands, but it would say that through the use of the Federal Tax Code, through giving tax credits to the holders of those bonds in lieu of interest, we are going to let those local authorities stretch those dollars a great deal further. That is a non-intrusive approach that leaves the decision where it should be, but makes the Federal Tax Code the friend of those who would invest in our children and invest in our school infrastructure.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I think the gentleman is right. We never hear those complaints when it comes to building other things that we allow the Tax Code to be used for. I think that is the secret here. I think the leadership in this House has an obligation to the American people to say we are either for children or we are against them. If they do not bring it up, we know where they stand.

When you have over 225 Members sign a piece of legislation and you cannot get it on the floor of this House, it is obvious that they have decided in their great wisdom that there is not that need. I think that is absolutely wrong.

As the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and I know, and you mentioned in your district, we were at Joyner Elementary School, and they had a little trailer park out back, literally, and the children were having to go back and forth. They were doing a good job. I remember what Kathleen Marynak, the principal, said. "We call these our cottages in the woods," I believe she said, trying to help the students, but literally they had to walk up a hill, and when it rained they got in trouble.

We went to Wake Forest Elementary and talked to the principal, he was standing there, and he said we have 829 students in a school originally built for 361 students. They added to it, but they had an awful lot of portable facilities there.

It is just not right at this time. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) is well aware of this and the gentleman touched about growth communities. In Johnston County, a county south of Wake, and it is true of every county around because we are growing, they built a new school and had something like 18 trailers. They moved those off and opened a new school, and they are now back up to

eight. It is growing that rapidly. The students have to walk through rain to get there. I remember what Nell Ferguson said. She said we do the best we can. We nurture all we can.

But we get back to the problem that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) talked about, which is this whole issue of children starting lunch early. If you are a little fellow, I just wonder how many Members of Congress, and, now, we sometimes do not get to eat lunch and I understand that, but every day if you had to go eat lunch at 10, 10:15 or 10:30, and you are in a controlled situation and do not get a snack until you are home at 3:30 or 4, if you are on a bus, I wonder how many adults would like that around here?

Mr. HOLT. Yes, I can imagine. Some days I know what that is like.

I would like to turn our attention to your school construction legislation, because I would like to believe that if my colleagues here understood it, and if the leadership really understood the legislation that the gentleman has put forward, they would not stand in the hallways, they would not block this. It makes such good sense.

I would like to ask my colleague to explain for us why this is not taking away local initiative, the local control of schools? As my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), said, part of the genius of this is it allows the local school districts to decide when and what needs to be constructed.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. The gentleman is absolutely correct, because the way it is drafted, the locals only pay the principal back. They determine it. The interest is paid by all of us as citizens in this country. It is not unique, because we do it on other kinds of projects in this country. For some to say it has not been done, it was really done in education right after World War II, some money was appropriated because of the growth.

We are at a time now where we are seeing phenomenal growth, a tremendous economy, none like we have ever seen before in this country, and we not only have an obligation, we have a great opportunity to make a difference and propel this economy at a whole new level.

As we move forward and as we talk about construction, as important as that is, and that is a critical part, we need people to go in those classrooms, the 100,000 teachers, the next installment we are talking about this year. That is going to be a fight before we adjourn, count on it. They want to block grant it.

Well, having been State superintendent, I will share with you what a block grant means, and to my other colleagues. I want Members to understand what we are talking about. It means you use it for whatever you want to use it for.

As a Member of this Congress, if I want it spend it for teachers, and I think the people out there would tell

you it goes for class sizes, put it on teachers, I guarantee you parents will say the same thing. They do not want it diluted.

As we do that, one of the critical pieces we are going to be facing over the next 10 years is replacing all the teachers that have the ability to retire. I think that is a great challenge, one of the challenges. While we are on this, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) introduced some legislation, and I hope he will share his thoughts on that as we look between the two of you at this whole issue, because having taught, you understand it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank my colleague for referring to this, because it clearly is part of this solution. As we build additional classrooms, as we get children into lower class sizes, especially in the early grades, we are going to need quality teachers to teach those children.

As a matter of fact, we are confronting a teacher shortage in this country, and it is going to get a great deal worse before it gets better. The estimates are we will need to hire 2 million new teachers in the United States over the next 10 years; and in North Carolina, we are going to need to find 80,000 new teachers. Believe me, that is a great deal more than we are producing at the present time.

That is a lot of manpower and woman power we are going to need to bring into the classroom. This 100,000 new teachers proposal of the Presidents is an important down payment on that, and, goodness knows, we should not go home before we do that. I cannot imagine we could do any less than bring on an additional installment of those 100,000 new teachers in the classroom.

But, as my colleague said, we have a piece of legislation that I think is very promising for the long haul, and I would like to commend it to colleagues. These colleagues here tonight have very generously cosponsored this bill, it is H.R. 4143, the Teaching Fellows Act.

This is legislation, just briefly, that would build on some successful State experiences in recruiting and training teachers. We have in North Carolina the North Carolina Fellows Program which takes high school seniors and gives them a scholarship to take them through the 4 years of training to be teachers. But it is so much more than just money, it is not just a scholarship. This cohort of students goes through college with an extracurricular program that solidifies their professional identity and trains them in what it means to be a professional, what it means to serve the community. The retention rate for these teachers, the people who stay with the program after they have done their obligation, is very, very high. This is a State-based program that has worked very, very well, and we would like to take this nationwide. We would like to build on it in North Carolina and see States across the country do this.

There is a second feature to this, and this is something that I think is something new, although in North Carolina we are making a start with our North Carolina model teaching consortium. The idea here is to reach into our 2-year schools, reach into our community colleges and take paraprofessionals, people who may be training as teacher's assistants, and give them the wherewithal and the incentive to go on for that full 4 years, because I think that is an excellent source of teachers. These people are rooted in the community, they are already serving children, and, with an additional incentive and with some work at the institutional level to make sure there is a seamless transition from that 2-year to 4-year program, I think we will have a whole new resource there for our teaching force out of our community colleges.

So those are the two main components, the Teaching Fellows Program for high school seniors and then the Teaching Fellows Partnership Program for students in community colleges. We have a number of cosponsors, a number of people who have indicated an interest in this.

I just think the quality and quantity of our teaching force is probably going to be the dominant public education issue over the next decade, and I believe this legislation could help us prepare for it.

Mr. HOLT. If the gentleman would yield, I would like to underscore a couple of points that he has made about these numbers. The latest numbers I have from the Department of Education say that in the next 10 years we will need somewhat more than 2 million, probably 2.2 million new teachers, just to stay even. This is not to have smaller class sizes, to reach this optimum of 18 students in the early grades, but this is just to stay even with the attrition, the retirement of the teachers and the students that are now in the pipeline.

Where are we going to get these teachers? This raises questions of where we will recruit them, how we will encourage them and mentor them, train them and see that they are treated as the professionals that they are, and how they will get ongoing professional development. I think the gentleman's proposal is a very good one, and that will help in this.

We must at the same time work for smaller class sizes. The President's proposal, he has made this a personal cause, is to get smaller class sizes in the early few years, and I hope we can do that.

Once again we are coming to the end of the appropriations cycle and the money is not there. In the past 2 years the President has been able to succeed in the negotiations with his masterful negotiation skills to get the installments on these 100,000 new teachers. I just hope we will be able, before we go out of session this year, to get the next installment on that.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I think we all have to push toward that end,

and I hope we can have a good bipartisan effort on that. There is no reason before we go home that we should not have the next sizable installment of those 100,000 new teachers on the way into classrooms in those early grades across this country, and there is no reason that we should not have this school construction program in place so that local school authorities, who know firsthand what the needs are, can take advantage of this and get those facilities on line.

There has been a lot of talk about whether this Congress is going to go down in history as a high achiever or a low achiever. Right now it is looking more on the low side. What could change that would be for us to catch on fire here in these remaining weeks and do a job for public education.

□ 1900

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would also, before we finish this, just commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) for his very attractive tax credit school bond proposal. It would be of great benefit to districts like mine. New Jersey would be able to get on with building a couple hundred million dollars worth of school construction, just in my State, if this legislation goes through. I certainly am doing all I can to advance this legislation, and I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for bringing it forward and for pushing it. There are only a few precious weeks of legislative time left this year, and this is surely one of the most important things that is remaining on our agenda.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, let me chime in and also thank my colleague from the neighboring district in North Carolina. We have worked together cooperatively on so many things, and there is nothing more important than this. I thank the gentleman for calling this Special Order and for focusing all of our attention on the unfinished business in the days ahead.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleagues who are still on the floor and others who have left this evening, because we really are serious about this issue. It is an issue that is critical to America's future as we talk in this Special Order about creative solutions to these problems. Certainly school construction is part of it as we invest in a national commitment to educational excellence where schools are accountable to our taxpayers for raising standards and every child has an opportunity to learn. One cannot learn when one is not in the right kind of conditions. Improving education in this country is about creating a classroom environment where children can learn and teachers can teach.

Mr. Speaker, I was in Sampson County on Sunday and dedicated a new school. It was amazing how important

that school, on the outskirts of a small community, identifies a community. Our schools do identify communities. We need to foster a greater connection between students, teachers, and parents. Our schools can do better; and with our help, they will do better, and we have to quit pointing fingers and start joining hands.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing what a hand is about when we give a helping hand instead of pointing fingers. We are good at pointing fingers around here. One of the best ways we can improve education, as we have talked about this evening, is to help provide for smaller class size, help provide for more teachers, where we can have orderly and disciplined classrooms, where children get the additional attention that is so badly needed.

We have children coming to our public schools to start from a variety of backgrounds, children who are loved; unfortunately, some who are not loved like they should be. Some who are well advanced and others who are not. But teachers try not to differentiate; they love and care for all of them and try to ignite that flame of learning in each child. They can only do it if we give them the help and support they need.

We do need a national commitment to the notion that parents in America have the right to expect that their children will have the best teacher in the world in that classroom. There are places in this country where they absolutely do not have the money; they do not have the resources to do it. They cannot build the buildings, and they cannot hire the teachers. Dagburnit, we ought to be about helping them. That is what America is about. We need to provide support for teachers as they do this difficult, difficult task.

It is a critically important job. It is the most important job we are about in rearing children early. We have had enough teacher-bashing in this body the last few years; and an awful lot of it, I am sorry to say, has come from my Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and that must end and it must end now. We have to come together and help. We are in this thing together. Our children deserve no less. We must make every neighborhood school in this country work, and work as they should.

That is why we are working to help pass H.R. 4094, and that is a bipartisan piece of legislation. I am thankful that we have finally gotten there. It does provide \$25 billion for school construction money across the country. A lot of money? Yes. Not nearly enough to get the job done, but enough to get started and say we do have a commitment at the national level; and yes, we are going to be a partner. Unfortunately, this Congress has failed to act, and the leadership has not brought it to the floor to provide our local communities with the assistance they need.

Mr. Speaker, our schools are bursting at the seams. In communities throughout my district and across this coun-

try, the flood of student enrollments keep coming, and at the public school level, there will not be and cannot be a sign on the door that says, no vacancy. We can do that in a lot of other schools. Private schools can say, we cannot take anyone else. Colleges and universities can find a way not to accept, but when school opens in September and August and they keep coming as they transfer, they take them, and classes get overcrowded. We must continue to take them and help them. We have to help our schools meet this challenge.

This Congress must take action to help these communities cope with this urgent problem, and we must act this year. We cannot wait another year. For many of these children who will be stuck in trailers, shoved in closets, crammed in the bathrooms and in converted other rooms, gymnasiums, substandard facilities, that is not acceptable in a country that has the resources we have. This country needs to help schools where better order and discipline can foster better learning for all of our children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Congress to stop playing partisan games, to lay down our swords and pick up the language of working together and put our Nation's children first. Pass school construction legislation without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, I have written a letter to the President with the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and a number of my colleagues insisting that school construction, in any final budget compromise with the congressional Republicans, be the highest priority. More than 150 of my colleagues have joined me; and I trust before early next week, we will have over 200 names, as we have on the bill.

The American people consider this their highest priority. They want to improve education by building new schools, hiring new teachers, reducing class sizes and improving order and discipline in the classrooms so that our children can get the attention they need and learn as they should learn.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank my Democratic colleagues for joining me this evening in this very important Special Order. There are a lot of things we deal with in this body that are important, no question about it. This is the people's House, one of the greatest Nations in the world. But I am here to tell my colleagues that there is no issue that we face on the threshold of the 21st century that is more important to the security of this Nation, to the prosperity that we hope to have in the 21st century, than that we have the resolve and the commitment to do what needs to be done for the children of America.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, back in July this body unfortunately rejected a motion to instruct conferees on the FY 2001 Labor/HHS/Education appropriations bill—a motion that insisted on more education funding and dedicated funding for class size reduction and

school renovation. Personally, I couldn't believe this motion to instruct failed. I say this because as parents all across America know, our nation's schools are overcrowded.

Children in Texas returned to school in August, and I can tell you that over the past several weeks I have heard again and again from parents talking about the need to address the challenge of overcrowded schools.

Total public and private elementary and secondary school enrollment has continued to rise, from 52.8 million in 1999 to a projected all-time record of 53.0 million this fall. These numbers are projected to rise for most of the century.

The point I simply want to make today is that as the United States embraces these new generations and new arrivals to our schools, we must be prepared to be able to provide a quality education to all students. We must help communities nationwide modernize their schools and we must support class size reduction so that America's children are in an environment where they can realize their full potential. These are smart investments—investments that merit broad bipartisan support.

INTEREST AMERICANS PAY FOR CURRENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VITTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the topic, Interested in the Interest that Americans Pay for Their Own Currency, and I hope we are. I think we should be.

The interest owed on our national debt to the Federal Reserve System is a disgrace. One day it will be the single largest budget item in our national budget. It ranks number two presently, but not by much. And Americans pay interest also on their currency. I will repeat that. Americans pay interest also on their currency; indirectly, of course, but it is still true.

Currency is borrowed into circulation. Actually, we pay interest on the bonds that needlessly back our currency. The U.S. Treasury could issue our cash without debt or interest as we issue our coins today. Member banks must put up collateral, U.S. interest-bearing bonds, when they place each request for Federal Reserve notes, according to the Federal Reserve Act, section 16, paragraph 2, in the amount equal to that request. The cost to each American is about \$100 each year to pay interest on these bonds, or really the cost of renting our cash from the Federal Reserve. So we actually pay a tax on, or a rental fee, to use the Federal Reserve's money. To repeat, our Treasury could issue our currency debt- and interest-free just like we issue our coins debt- and interest-free.

We understand all of this, I think, in that we use Federal Reserve notes to pay most of our bills and taxes. In the Federal Reserve Act, it originally stated in section 16 that these Federal Reserve notes shall be redeemed in lawful

money on demand at the Treasury Department of the United States, or at any Federal Reserve Bank. I am quoting from the act itself. An interesting question is, What is the lawful money mentioned in the original Federal Reserve Act that we will get when we redeem the Federal Reserve notes? That question is never answered.

But here is where the "money muddle," as James Warburg once called it, begins to get really muddy. When we redeem Federal Reserve notes, we get Federal Reserve notes in exchange. That is interesting. When we borrow from our bank, any bank, we do not get Federal Reserve notes in hand; we do not get cash. We open an account at the bank we are borrowing from and receive a bank draft to deposit in the new account that we were made to open when we borrowed the money. Well, not money, per se, but the notes. Today, this is all done through ETF, or electronic funds transfer.

Here is the point to all of this. There are no Federal Reserve notes on hand for us to borrow. According to the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, in their publication, *Modern Money Mechanics*, they state, and I quote: "Changes in the quantity of money may originate with the actions of the Federal Reserve System, the Central Bank, the commercial banks, or the public, but the major control rests with the Central Bank. The actual process of money creation takes place in the commercial banks. As noted earlier, demand liabilities of commercial banks are money. These liabilities are customers' accounts. They increase when the customers deposit currency and checks, and when the proceeds of loans made by the banks are credited to borrowers' accounts. Banks can build up deposits by increasing loans and investments, so long as they keep enough currency on hand to redeem whatever amounts the holders of deposits want to convert into currency."

The Federal Reserve Board of Governors sets our interest rates, which then determine the price of money; not the quantity or the amount of money, but the price of money. The quantity of money I will discuss presently. The money aggregates, or the money supply indicators, like M-1 and M-2 used to be utilized in that determination. Interest rates went up; the money supply shrank. Interest rates were lowered, more money or credit really was released to the banks to lend. The money supply went up.

The Federal Reserve Board and its chairman have repeatedly stated that the M-1 and M-2 indicators are out of control and are no longer used in determining Fed policy. What is Fed policy, in capital letters. Well, Fed policy has always been to fight inflation and keep the overall economy going, prosperously going. But inflation, while still a minor concern of the Fed, though I do not agree, is of less concern.

Price stability is the clarion call for Fed policy today. The corporation's

price stability, presumably, although one may argue that this would be good for everyone, including consumers; but price stability as the goal only informs us of what the Fed seeks, not how it intends to achieve it.

□ 1915

If not money supply aggregates, M-1 and M-2, then what are the new indicators? It was announced several years ago in the business journals mostly, that the one new indicator, of the many used, is today what is called wage inflation. I shall return to that momentarily, but first we must look at the quantity of money again, not the price of money.

Businessmen, for example, and consumers as well, consider the price of money when they borrow. If interest rates are 7 percent rather than 6, the businessman will make the deal, rather than wait. Consumers often buy at the higher rates, rather than waiting for the price to go down some.

But even with interest rates on the rise, even if with just quarter point increases, the money supply used to shrink. Yet, that is not the case any longer. The Fed now places money in the hands of member banks in what are called repurchase agreements, or repos. It may be placed with the banks overnight, or for 7 days, or for whatever time the board wants. They can roll it over at will. They can reclaim it at will.

The member banks do not have the option to take or not take the funds and they pay interest on these new funds, but as a noted financial adviser stated, the banks only have the right to say, "Thank you very much, sir;" in other words, they have no choice in the matter.

Where does this new money go? That is the real point, here. The new money goes almost immediately into the financial markets; the stock market, primarily. It depends on the quantity the Fed pumps into the banks' hands.

Here is a fine example. During the 6-months period just prior to year end, that is, Y2K, Chairman Greenspan expanded the adjusted monetary base dramatically. It is a spike almost vertical on the chart supplied by the St. Louis Federal Reserve Bank.

At certain points, the annual growth rate for a given month was as high as 50 percent. During the entire 6 months it was running at about 25 percent annual growth. This was far outstripping growth in productivity. Billions of dollars were pumped into the banking system, some \$70 billion.

Where did the money go? It had to go into the financial markets. No other area of the economy could absorb such an enormous increase so suddenly.

The banks called upon everyone, from brokerage houses to money managers. They were having to give the new money away at ridiculously low rates of return. Most of the new money was loaned into the financial markets, the stock market, and most in the high-tech industry.

Most was pure speculation on margin; that is, much of it by folks who today believe there is no risk any longer in investing in the stock market. This was the real cause for our much acclaimed boom in the market run-up prior to the year end 1999.

Many market participants understood that this was a false boom, an anomaly created out of thin air by Chairman Greenspan's governors. They immediately took their winnings, the profits on the run-up. They paid dearly in capital gains taxes levied, about \$70 billion in capital gains taxes.

Curiously, that windfall for the administration matches pristinely with the acclaimed surplus President Clinton immediately took credit for in his wise oversight of the economy.

But if this surplus was real, why did the national debt continue to rise? There is no surplus, is the answer. There was just a sudden windfall in capital gains taxes some argue was orchestrated by Chairman Greenspan.

I would ask the chairman if I were given more time, what did he think would happen when he expanded the adjusted monetary base upwards in such a dramatic fashion? Does he no longer believe Milton Friedman's axiom regarding the reckless increase in the supply of money? Is it not supposed to cause dislocations any longer because of this new economy?

If that is true, then what of the actions of the Fed the week after Y2K? Within 7 days, the Fed policy reversed itself just as dramatically downwards. The Fed repurchased the funds by nearly the same amount over the next several months, beginning with the year 2000.

The dramatic decline in the adjusted monetary base corresponds directly with the violent corrections in the stock market, and especially NASDAQ. Those with less savvy, like so many speculators, gamblers, really, were wiped out. This is no coincidence, but correspondence. This is not just convoluted, but consequences. What did Chairman Greenspan think was going to happen?

Let me quote the chairman from a speech this July 12, 2000, the year 2000, at the appropriately titled "Financial Crisis Conference at the Council on Foreign Relations."

"Despite the increased sophistication and complexity of financial instruments, it is not possible to take account in today's market transactions of all possible future outcomes. Markets operate under uncertainty. It is therefore crucial to market performance that participants manage their risks properly. It is no doubt more effective to have mechanisms that allow losses to show through regularly and predictably than to have them allocated by some official entity in the wake of default."

If that statement were not sufficient to rile a risk-taker as market participant Greenspan goes on to dryly add, "Private market processes have served

this country and the world economy well to date, and we should rely on them as much as possible as we go forward."

This is how the Fed managed price stability? Now, let me return to wage inflation. Is wage inflation inflation? As I pointed out above, wage inflation is the newest indicator the Fed looks at in determining fed policy on interest rates.

Members will read in the business pages that the Fed determined that there was no real wage inflation concern, so interest rates remained as they are. Or should there be some indicator that wage inflation is a factor, interest rates may have to be increased.

If Members can understand the relationships, they should be as outraged as I am. Everybody knows that labor is almost always, and everywhere in industry, the number one and always at least number two cost of operations figure for every company, especially the largest monopoly multinationals, and it is the largest multinationals' bottom line that the Fed protects when it talks about price stability. That is a frightening thought.

Price stability is achieved by keeping wage inflation under control. This means nothing short of this: If wages of workers begin to rise, should workers begin to see the benefits of this booming economy, the Fed will raise interest rates, slowing the economy and driving wages down. More workers will lose their jobs, thus driving down wages.

We do this for the corporations' stability in pricing the goods these workers help to produce. And we call this free enterprise, the hidden hand working through our free system?

Let me quote Adam Smith, father of the so-called free enterprise: "Masters are always and everywhere in a sort of tacit, but constant and uniform, combination, not to raise the wages of labor above their actual rate. To violate this combination is everywhere a most unpopular action, and a sort of reproach to a master among his neighbors and equals. We seldom, indeed, hear of this combination because it is usual, and one may say the natural state of things. . . . Masters, too, sometimes enter into particular combinations to sink wages of labor even below this rate. These are always conducted with the utmost silence and secrecy, 'til the moment of execution."

There shall be no more silence on these efforts by our masters. It may be, but it was never intended to be, "the natural state of things" to sink wages of labor below their actual rate, not in the United States of America; not where the people, mostly wage-earners, are the sovereigns. This statement is surely a reproach to a master, the Fed master, among his equals, if not his neighbors.

But there is more, much more. Congress has found that Federal reserve notes circulate as our legitimate cur-

rency, otherwise called money, issued by the Federal Reserve in response to interest-bearing debt instruments, usually the United States bonds. I already pointed out above that member banks must put out an equal amount of collateral when they request any amount of Federal reserve notes. They pay interest on this amount, too. That is to say, we indirectly pay interest on our paper money in circulation. Whether bonds, loans, et cetera, we pay interest.

The total cost of the interest is roughly \$25 billion annually, or about \$100 per person in the United States. Over \$500 billion in just United States bonds are held by the Federal Reserve as backing for the notes. The Federal Reserve collects interest on these bonds from the U.S. Government, returning most of it to the U.S. Treasury.

The Federal Reserve is paid sufficiently well for all of the services it provides: regulatory, check-clearing, Fedwire, automation, compliance, and so forth. There is no rational, logical reason why Americans must pay interest on their circulating medium of exchange.

Why are we paying interest to the Fed for renting the Federal Reserve notes that we use? Why do we not issue United States Treasury currency that can be issued like our coins are issued, debt-free and without interest?

Donald F. Kettle in his book, one of the better books on the Fed, actually, "Leadership at the Fed," stated, "Members of Congress were far more likely to tell Federal officials what they disliked than what policy approaches they approved."

As an understatement of all time, given wage inflation as indicator, John M. Berry in the journal *Central Banking* stated that FED officials are not all that forthcoming in their policy announcements because they "prefer to be seen as acting essentially as controllers of inflation, not employment maximizers."

I do not wish to be seen as one of those Members of Congress that only expresses his displeasure at the Fed policies. I shall therefore propose some solutions as a starting point. It is but one place to begin.

Congress must pass a law declaring Federal Reserve notes to be official U.S. Treasury currency, which would continue to circulate as it does today. The Federal Reserve system, then freed of the \$500 billion in liabilities, which the Federal Reserve notes are now considered to be liabilities, but if we freed them from that liability, they would then simply return the U.S. Treasury bonds which backed the Federal Reserve notes to the U.S. Treasury.

That is, if they are holding the notes to back our currency and we declare they are United States Treasury currency, no longer Federal Reserve currency, then they no longer need the backing, and could return some \$500 billion in liabilities or in U.S. Treasury bonds back to the Federal Reserve, back to the U.S. Treasury.

This reduces the national debt by over \$500 billion, and reduces interest payments by over \$25 billion annually, with no real loss to anyone.

Let me repeat that. If we did this, merely declared that the money we use is officially United States Treasury currency, then the Fed could return the \$500 billion in bonds that they hold and reduce the national debt by \$500 billion, reduce our annual payments by about \$25 billion, with no real loss to anyone. We do this while protecting the member banks' collateral they each put up when they requested the notes originally. This is not a complicated proposal, and the rationale behind it is seen by many financial minds of note as logical and doable.

□ 1930

Then the Fed officials that have devised the monetary indicator called wage inflation should reconsider just exactly who is paying the real price for price stability and report to the Banking Committees of both Houses what indicators they might utilize rather than this horrendous approach, an approach that even Adam Smith denounced over 200 years ago.

Finally, the Fed must restrain the drastic monetary expansions and retractions using the methods described above. For whatever reasoning the Adjusted Monetary Base was inflated, causing the wild speculation in the financial markets just prior to Y2K and the subsequent disaster for so many when the base was suddenly deflated like a child's balloon, this should be subject to the most minute scrutiny.

My intent here was not just to demonstrate my dislike for some of the Fed's policies. I could write a discourse on the area that the Fed has done well. But so many of my colleagues prefer that course, I should seem redundant. In any case, the Federal Reserve Board has more than enough congratulatory praise from various corners that my praise would fall upon deaf ears.

I hope my unapologetic approach may serve to give some pause to these most important issues for all Americans, investors, owners, and workers alike. Clearly the Fed Board and the Fed Chairman especially are the single most powerful individuals ever granted, delegated the most important enumerated powers guaranteed to this Congress by the Constitution. It should be little to ask that they take heed in how they wield that power. If they are going to act like Masters, Fed Masters, then I strongly urge those individuals to rethink some of the policies they put forward and rethink in whose interests they serve.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of business in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ETHERIDGE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. STABENOW, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RADANOVICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHIMKUS, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1729. An act to designate the Federal facility located at 1301 Emmet Street in Charlottesville, Virginia, as the "Pamela B. Gwin Hall".

H.R. 1901. An act to designate the United States border station located in Pharr, Texas, as the "Kika de la Garza United States Border Station".

H.R. 1959. An act to designate the Federal building located at 643 East Durango Boulevard in San Antonio, Texas, as the "Adrian A. Spears Judicial Training Center".

H.R. 4608. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 220 West Depot Street in Greenville, Tennessee, as the "James H. Quillen United States Courthouse".

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1374. An act to authorize the development and maintenance of a multi-agency campus project in the town of Jackson, Wyoming.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 18, 2000, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

10019. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agri-

culture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Asian Longhorned Beetle Regulations; Addition to Regulated Area [Docket No. 00-077-1] received September 7, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10020. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the approved retirement and advancement to the grade of lieutenant general of Lieutenant General David W. McIlvoy, United States Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

10021. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting Congressional Budget Office and Office of Management and Budget estimates under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, for P.L. 106-246, pursuant to Public Law 105-33 section 10205(2) (111 Stat. 703); to the Committee on the Budget.

10022. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District—received August 31, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce.

10023. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Establishment of Alternative Compliance Periods under the Anti-Dumping Program—received August 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10024. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Final Rule—Hazardous Air Pollutants: Amendments to the Approval of State Programs and Delegation of Federal Authorities—received August 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10025. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Program Planning, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, CC Docket No. 98-147, Order on Reconsideration and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, and Fifth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 96-98—received August 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10026. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting reports on designs and tests of combinatorial bidding, pursuant to FCC Contracts; to the Committee on Commerce.

10027. A letter from the Associate Chief, Wireless Telecommunications, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of part I of the Commission's Rules—Competitive Bidding Procedures [Docket No. 97-82] received September 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10028. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 17-00 which constitutes a Request for Final Approval for a Project Agreement with Sweden Concerning Cooperative Research and Development in Trajectory Correctable Munitions., pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

10029. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Singapore [Transmittal No. DTC 89-00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

10030. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—2000-2001 Refuge-Specific Hunting and Sport Fishing Regulations (RIN: 1018-AG01) received September 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10031. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of the Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30150; Amdt. No. 2005] received September 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10032. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Allison Engine Company AE 3007A and 3007C Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2000-NE-33-AD; Amendment 39-11891; AD 2000-18-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10033. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30177; Amdt. No. 424] received September 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10034. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendment [Docket No. 30148; Amdt. No. 2003] received September 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10035. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30174; Amdt. No. 2006] received September 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10036. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30176; Amdt. No. 2008] received September 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10037. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directive; Aerospaciale Model ATR42-300, -300, and -320 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-270-AD; Amendment 39-11883; AD 2000-17-0-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10038. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300, A300-600, and A310 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-54-AD; Amendment 39-11892; AD 2000-18-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10039. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Kaman Model K-1200 Helicopters [Docket No. 2000-SW-32-AD;

Amendment 39-11895; AD 2000-18-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10040. A letter from the Program Assistant, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211-524D4 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2000-NE-23-AD; Amendment 39-11888; AD 2000-18-03] received September 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10041. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Aerospaiale Model ATR42 and ATR72 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-183-AD; Amendment 39-11890; AD 2000-18-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10042. A letter from the Program Assistant, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class D Airspace; Cocoa Patrick AFB, FL, and Class E5 Airspace; Melbourne, FL [Docket No. 00-ASO-32] received September 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10043. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 727 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-75-AD; Amendment 39-11816; AD 2000-14-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10044. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Models A65, A65-8200, 65-B80, 70, 95-A55, 95-B55, 95-C55, D55, E55, 56TC, A56TC, 58, 58P, 58TC, and 95-B55B (T24A) Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-CE-53-AD; Amendment 39-11887; AD 2000-18-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10045. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Increase in Rates Payable Under the Montgomery GI Bill—Active Duty (RIN: 2900-AJ89) received September 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

10046. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Department of Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Rules Regarding Optional Forms of Benefit Under Qualified Retirement Plans [Doc. TD8900] (RIN: 1545-AW27) received September 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10047. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Qualified Lessee Construction Allowances for Short-term Leases [Doc. TD 8901] (RIN: 1545-AW16) received September 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10048. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest [Notice 2000-46] received September 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10049. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting

the Service's final rule—2000 National Pool [Rev. Proc. 2000-36] received September 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10050. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the third annual report on the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10051. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a report that the Department of Energy will require an additional 45 days to transmit the implementation plan for addressing the issues raised in the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board's Recommendation; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2267. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to clarify Federal authority relating to land acquisition from willing sellers for the majority of the trails, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106-846). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2752. A bill to give Lincoln County, Nevada, the right to purchase at fair market value certain public land located within that county, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 106-847). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 4521. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to authorize and provide funding for rehabilitation of the Going-to-the-Sun Road in Glacier National Park, to authorize funds for maintenance of utilities related to the Park, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106-848). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LEACH: Committee on Banking and Financial Services. H.R. 4096. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to produce currency, postage stamps, and other security documents at the request of foreign governments, and security documents at the request of the individual States or any political subdivision thereof, on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-849). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 238. A bill to amend section 274 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to impose mandatory minimum sentences, and increase certain sentences, for bringing in and harboring certain aliens and to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide enhanced penalties for persons committing such offenses while armed; with an amendment (Rept. 106-850). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCCOLLUM: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1349. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to combat the over-utilization of prison health care services and control rising prisoner health care costs; with an amendment (Rept. 106-851). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2883. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to confer United

States citizenship automatically and retroactively on certain foreign-born children adopted by citizens of the United States; with amendments (Rept. 106-852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4870. A bill to make technical corrections in patent, copyright, and trademark laws; with an amendment (Rept. 106-853). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 4404. A bill to permit the payment of medical expenses incurred by the United States Park Police in the performance of duty to be made directly by the National Park Service, to allow for waiver and indemnification in mutual law enforcement agreements between the National Park Service and a State or political subdivision when required by State law, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106-854 Pt. 1).

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the Committee on Government Reform discharged. H.R. 4404 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 4404. Referral to the Committee on Government Reform extended for a period ending not later than September 14, 2000.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FLETCHER (for himself, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. CRANE, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. TANCREDI, Mr. CAMP, Ms. DUNN, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 5173. A bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to sections 103(b)(2) and 213(b)(2)(C) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 to reduce the public debt and to decrease the statutory limit on the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. NEY, Mr. MICA, Mr. EWING, Mr. LINDER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. HOYER):

H.R. 5174. A bill to amend titles 10 and 18, United States Code, and the Revised Statutes to remove the uncertainty regarding the authority of the Department of Defense to permit buildings located on military installations and reserve component facilities to be used as polling places in Federal, State, and local elections for public office; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OXLEY (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. BARCIA, and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 5175. A bill to provide relief to small businesses from liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 5176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives to introduce new technologies to reduce energy consumption in buildings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 5177. A bill to establish the Administrative Law Judge Conference of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALLENGER (for himself and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 5178. A bill to require changes in the bloodborne pathogens standard in effect under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD):

H.R. 5179. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to limit the number of overtime hours of licensed health care employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BASS (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. HORN, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. BERREUTER):

H.R. 5180. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full funding for assistance for education of all children with disabilities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 5181. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a refundable credit against income tax for the purchase of computer software that filters child pornography and material that is violent, obscene, or harmful to minors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. CARSON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. LEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH):

H.R. 5182. A bill to protect day laborers from unfair labor practices; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LAMPSON (for himself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 5183. A bill to authorize the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to lease, jointly-develop, or otherwise use a commercially provided inflatable habitation module for the International Space Station; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. MOORE (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BERRY, Mr. TANNER, Mr.

MINGE, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. PHELPS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Ms. DANNER, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BOYD, and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky):

H.R. 5184. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives to encourage small business health plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. QUINN, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WU, Mr. LARSON, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. LAMPSON):

H.R. 5185. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to give employers and performers in the live performing arts, rights given by section 8(e) of such Act to employers and employees in similarly situated industries, to give such employers and performers the same rights given by section 8(f) of such Act to employers and employees in the construction industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PICKERING (for himself and Mr. JOHN):

H.R. 5186. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish scholarship and loan repayment programs regarding the provision of veterinary services in veterinarian shortage areas; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POMEROY:

H.R. 5187. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to permit a State to register a Canadian pesticide for distribution and use within that State; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. THURMAN:

H.R. 5188. A bill to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act to extend the applicability of such Act to individuals determined to have a mental capacity less than 18 years of age; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WAMP, Mr. KLINK, Mr. JENKINS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. PHELPS, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.R. 5189. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation for certain individuals employed in connection with Federal nuclear weapons programs who sustained occupational illness in the line of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WEXLER:

H.R. 5190. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to impose criminal and civil penalties for false statements and failure to file reports concerning defects in foreign motor vehicle products, and to require the timely provision of notice of such defects,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WEYGAND:

H.R. 5191. A bill to provide for the convening of a White House Conference on United States Energy Policy to develop a national energy policy; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WEYGAND:

H.R. 5192. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to improve the coverage of needy children under the State Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) and the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ISTOOK (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H. Con. Res. 400. Concurrent resolution congratulating the Republic of Hungary on the millennium of its foundation as a state; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. WU, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H. Con. Res. 401. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding high-level visits by Taiwanese officials to the United States; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL (for himself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LARSON, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. OSE, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. SISISKY, and Mr. SKELTON):

H. Con. Res. 402. Concurrent resolution recognizing the importance of the Selective Service System on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the United States' first peacetime military registration effort and the continued need for American men to register for possible service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALL of Ohio (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. LANTOS):

H. Res. 577. A resolution to honor the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) for its role as a protector of the world's refugees, to celebrate UNHCR's 50th anniversary, and to praise the High Commissioner Sadako Ogata for her work with UNHCR for the past ten years; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SCHAFFER (for himself, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. PAUL, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BUYER, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. SOUDER, and Mrs. WILSON):

H. Res. 578. A resolution congratulating home educators and home schooled students across the Nation for their ongoing contributions to education and for the role they play in promoting and ensuring a brighter, stronger future for this Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 284: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 303: Mr. BOEHLERT.
 H.R. 453: Mr. NEY and Mr. DELAHUNT.
 H.R. 531: Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 568: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
 H.R. 583: Mr. RYUN of Kansas.
 H.R. 776: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 804: Mr. HOBSON.
 H.R. 827: Mr. BORSKI.
 H.R. 842: Mr. BUYER.
 H.R. 1032: Mr. BOEHLERT.
 H.R. 1044: Mr. SANDLIN.
 H.R. 1168: Mr. CHAMBLISS.
 H.R. 1300: Mr. BARR of Georgia.
 H.R. 1577: Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 1592: Mr. LAMPSON.
 H.R. 1671: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 1841: Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
 H.R. 2003: Mr. SHAYS.
 H.R. 2066: Mr. BENTSEN.
 H.R. 2166: Mr. SABO, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. LARSON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. CARSON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MASCARA, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
 H.R. 2308: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. CAMP.
 H.R. 2341: Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. MOORE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WICKER, Ms. ROSELENTINEN, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 2420: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. TANCREDO.
 H.R. 2492: Mr. QUINN.
 H.R. 2631: Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 2706: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 2710: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. SHAYS.
 H.R. 2720: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
 H.R. 2780: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. HAYWORTH.
 H.R. 2867: Mr. HALL of Texas.
 H.R. 2870: Mr. BISHOP, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. RIVERS.
 H.R. 2907: Ms. PELOSI.
 H.R. 3161: Mr. OLVER and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 3219: Mr. BARR of Georgia.
 H.R. 3327: Mr. WU.
 H.R. 3408: Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.
 H.R. 3633: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania and Ms. MCKINNEY.
 H.R. 3700: Mrs. THURMAN.
 H.R. 3710: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
 H.R. 3766: Mr. REYES, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 3842: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BASS, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Ms. DELAURO,

Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. INSLEE.
 H.R. 4025: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 4041: Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 4042: Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 4046: Mr. GILMAN, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 4144: Ms. CARSON.
 H.R. 4215: Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 4219: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. MCINNIS.
 H.R. 4257: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. MCINNIS.
 H.R. 4277: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. KIND, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. SHERWOOD.
 H.R. 4278: Mr. BOYD.
 H.R. 4302: Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 4324: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. HILL of Montana.
 H.R. 4328: Mr. BACA, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. HORN.
 H.R. 4330: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. McNULTY.
 H.R. 4375: Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 4393: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.
 H.R. 4395: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
 H.R. 4428: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 4495: Mr. STUMP, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. DANNER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
 H.R. 4543: Mr. WAMP and Mr. SPRATT.
 H.R. 4547: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. SANDLIN.
 H.R. 4548: Mr. JENKINS, Mr. OSE, and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.
 H.R. 4552: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 4624: Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 4649: Mr. NADLER, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Ms. DANNER.
 H.R. 4723: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Mr. FOSSELLA.
 H.R. 4728: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. DUNN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H.R. 4773: Mr. PICKETT.
 H.R. 4780: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. CANADY of Florida, and Mr. HUTCHINSON.
 H.R. 4792: Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 4794: Mr. HOFFEL.
 H.R. 4825: Mr. CAMP, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 4841: Mr. BEREUTER.
 H.R. 4898: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FROST, and Mr. SANDLIN.
 H.R. 4902: Mr. HALL of Texas.
 H.R. 4926: Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHN, Ms.

KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KIND, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. REYES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SABO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHOWS, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
 H.R. 4927: Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 4935: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. STUPAK.
 H.R. 4949: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. BONIOR.
 H.R. 4966: Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 4972: Mr. BOEHNER.
 H.R. 4976: Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. KOLBE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. KASICH, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. LARSON.
 H.R. 5035: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 5051: Mr. MINGE.
 H.R. 5074: Mr. FORBES and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5109: Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CALLEGLEY, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
 H.R. 5118: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 5153: Mr. RAMSTAD.
 H.R. 5163: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. PHELPS.
 H.R. 5164: Mr. DINGELL.
 H.J. Res. 47: Mr. EDWARDS.
 H.J. Res. 60: Mr. BILBRAY.
 H.J. Res. 64: Mr. SHAYS.
 H.J. Res. 100: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. KIND.
 H. Con. Res. 58: Mr. MEEHAN.
 H. Con. Res. 271: Mr. TIERNEY.
 H. Con. Res. 273: Mr. MCHUGH.
 H. Con. Res. 306: Mr. SABO, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. SCARBOROUGH.
 H. Con. Res. 311: Mr. HOSTETTLER.
 H. Con. Res. 337: Mr. INSLEE.
 H. Con. Res. 346: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHN-SON of Texas.
 H. Con. Res. 364: Mr. WOLF, Mr. GORDON, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. CAMP, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.
 H. Con. Res. 382: Mr. WOLF.
 H. Con. Res. 390: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. FROST, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. SISISKY.
 H. Res. 213: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma.
 H. Res. 347: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. HOLT.
 H. Res. 537: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BOYD, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 654: Mr. LAFALCE.